

reference of claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PINCKNEY: Petition of Alexander Wade and 80 others, of Brookshire, Tex., favoring passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of Patrick A. Ricards, of Pittsburg, Pa., in favor of bill for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of citizens of Woodston, Kans., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Asherville Baptist Church and Asherville Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Kansas, for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Lincoln County, Kans., favoring the donation to the Beecher Island Memorial Association of the site of the Beecher Island battle—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of B. D. Brooks and 70 others, of Franklin, Kans., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of E. C. James and 46 others, of Waterford, Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Resolution of James A. Perkins Post, No. 156, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: Resolutions of the Brewers' Exchange of New Orleans, in opposition to the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Louisiana, requesting improvement of Bayou Lacombe, and citizens of Mississippi and Louisiana, asking for an appropriation to improve the Atchafalaya River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of A. C. Widner and 21 other citizens of Dekalb County, Ind., favoring reduction of internal-revenue tax on liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 11939, granting an increase of pension to C. C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany House bill for the establishment of aids to navigation for lighting Ambrose channel, New York Harbor—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHULL: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 12494, granting an increase of pension to Joseph Nell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 245, of Fort Worth, Tex., against the giving away of prizes and premiums with cigars and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Sparta, Ill., opposing passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SNOOK: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. McConkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of the Lumber Dealers' Association of Connecticut, favoring the establishment of a Government forest reserve in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Connecticut Society, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring printing of certain Revolutionary information—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Connecticut, opposing passage of the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of S. M. Brach and others, of Arlington Hills, Minn., favoring passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Paul, Minn., favoring passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Pacific Congregational, Arlington Hills Presbyterian, Swedish Baptist, and Grace Methodist churches, of St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of H. G. Schram and L. P. Furber, of Cottage Grove, Minn., opposing passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of building trades of St. Paul, opposing bill H. R. 89—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of St. Paul Board of Trade, opposing bill H. R. 89—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Implement Dealers' Association of Crookston, Minn., for repeal of bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of District Council, Carpenters and Joiners, of

Minneapolis, Minn., opposing the allowing of soldiers to do the work of civilian mechanics—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of St. Paul Board of Trade, favoring Quarles-Cooper bills, to give additional power to the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of St. Paul Board of Trade, favoring the Lodge consular-service bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Papers to accompany the bill granting a pension to Ida Diamond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Resolution of East Washington Citizens' Association, relative to the extension of Pennsylvania avenue east—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolution of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of bills S. 2259 and 2263—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for increase of pension to Henry Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of W. W. Folsom and 12 others, of Hope, Ark., favoring passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolution of Croasdale Post, No. 256, Grand Army of the Republic, of Riegelsville, Pa., favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Sergeant Hugh A. Martindell Post, No. 366, and Graham Post, No. 106, of Pottstown, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Bodine Post, No. 306, Grand Army of the Republic, of Doyleston, Pa., favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany claim of Martin Schubert—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, resolutions of Joseph A. Miller Post, No. 178, Grand Army of the Republic, of White County, Ill., favoring the passage of a service-pension law, and petition of neighbors of Henry H. Hollman, to accompany bill granting him an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Papers to accompany claim of Llewellyn Price—to the Committee on War Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 19, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

STEAMER BEAUMONT.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been directed by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to file the report on the bill (H. R. 4570) to provide an American register for the steamer *Beaumont*, which I have done, and I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until Monday to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks that the minority of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until Monday to file minority views on the bill H. R. 4570. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 45. Joint resolution directing inquiry into the claim of the Wales Island Packing Company.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. R. 45. Joint resolution directing inquiry into the claim of the Wales Island Packing Company—to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9640. An act to amend an act granting to the Keokuk and Hamilton Water Power Company right to construct and maintain a dam, and so forth, approved February 8, 1901;

H. R. 3584. An act to authorize the resubdivision of lots or blocks in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 11823. An act to authorize the Director of the Census to cooperate with the secretary of state of the State of Michigan and with officials of other States in taking the census of manufactures.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 4135. An act to authorize the Little Rock and Monroe Railway Company to construct, maintain, and use a bridge across Ouachita River, in the State of Louisiana, at a point between Ouachita City and the mouth of Bayou Loutre;

S. 2323. An act relating to ceded lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation;

S. R. 37. Joint resolution providing for the editions to be printed of the annual and special reports of the Librarian of Congress;

S. 1490. An act to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota; and

S. 1935. An act providing for the holding of an additional term of court in the northern district of West Virginia at Martinsburg, W. Va.

PROOF, ETC., UPON FINAL ENTRY OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LAMAR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8435) to amend the act of Congress of March 11, 1902, relating to homesteads.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to amend section 2294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," approved March 11, 1902, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That section 2294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 2294. That hereafter all proofs, affidavits, and oaths of any kind whatsoever required to be made by applicants and entrymen under the homestead, preemption, timber-culture, desert-land, and timber and stone acts may, in addition to those now authorized to take such affidavits, proofs, and oaths, be made before any United States commissioner or commissioner of the court exercising Federal jurisdiction in the Territory or before the judge or clerk of any court of record in the county, parish, or land district in which the lands are situated: *Provided*, That in case the affidavits, proofs, and oaths hereinbefore mentioned be taken out of the county in which the land is located the applicant must show by affidavit, satisfactory to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, that it was taken before the nearest or most accessible officer qualified to take said affidavits, proofs, and oaths in the land districts in which the lands applied for are located; but such showing by affidavit need not be made in making final proof if the proof be taken in the town or city where the newspaper is published in which the final proof notice is printed. The proof, affidavit, and oath, when so made and duly subscribed, shall have the same force and effect as if made before the register and receiver, when transmitted to them with the fees and commissions allowed and required by law.

"That if any witness making such proof, or any applicant making such affidavit or oath, shall knowingly, willfully, or corruptly swear falsely to any material matter contained in said proofs, affidavits, or oaths he shall be deemed guilty of perjury, and shall be liable to the same pains and penalties as if he had sworn falsely before the register. That the fees for entries and for final proofs, when made before any other officer than the register and receiver, shall be as follows:

"For each affidavit, 25 cents.

"For each deposition of claimant or witness, when not prepared by the officer, 25 cents.

"For each deposition of claimant or witness, prepared by the officer, \$1.

"Any officer demanding or receiving a greater sum for such service shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished for each offense by a fine not exceeding \$100."

The Clerk read the amendment recommended by the committee, as follows:

Amend by adding after line 16, page 2, "or which may have heretofore been so made and duly subscribed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPALDING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if this changes existing law?

Mr. LAMAR of Missouri. The only change is by the addition of the words "county" and "parish." As the law now is, proof can only be made in the land district. It frequently happens that the line runs between the county seat and the place where the land is situated, so that a man may have to go 45 or 50 miles, whereas under this law it might only be a short distance.

Mr. SPALDING. Then this changes the law back to the way it was a short time ago?

Mr. LAMAR of Missouri. I do not understand that it changes the law back. The bill has been approved by the Land Office and by the Secretary of the Interior. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I will say that while the bill appears complicated on its face, because it reenacts the entire section, yet the changes are very slight, and in fact conforms to the practice that has prevailed since the change in the law to which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SPALDING] has referred. A number of proofs have gone in where the county was divided, where a part of the land was in one district and part in another, and proof was made at the county seat for both districts. These proofs were accepted at the local office and rejected at the General Land Office. This law permits the proof to be made at the county seat, notwithstanding the land is located in two districts.

Mr. SPALDING. We passed an act two or three days ago remedying—

Mr. LACEY. This will cover cases in North Dakota as well as in Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if this bill covers proof taken under the timber-culture law, under similar circumstances?

Mr. LACEY. The bill says "homestead, preemption, timber-culture, desert-land, and timber and stone act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LAMAR of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

RIGHT OF WAY FOR PIPE LINES THROUGH INDIAN LAND.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3317) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian land.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to grant a right of way in the nature of an easement for the construction, operation, and maintenance of pipe lines for the conveyance of oil and gas through any Indian reservation, through any lands held by an Indian tribe or nation in the Indian Territory, through any lands reserved for an Indian agency or Indian school, or for other purpose in connection with the Indian service, or through any lands which have been allotted in severalty to any individual Indian under any law or treaty, but which have not been conveyed to the allottee with full power of alienation, upon the terms and conditions herein expressed. No such lines shall be constructed across Indian lands, as above mentioned, until authority therefor has first been obtained from, and the maps of definite location of said lines approved by, the Secretary of the Interior. The compensation to be paid the tribes in their tribal capacity and the individual allottees for such right of way through their lands shall be determined in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, and shall be subject to his final approval. And where such lines not are subject to State or Territorial taxation the company or owner of the line shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior, for the use and benefit of the Indians, such annual tax as he may designate, not exceeding \$5 for each 10 miles of line so constructed and maintained under such rules and regulations as said Secretary may prescribe. But nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to exempt the owners of such lines from the payment of any tax that may be lawfully assessed against them by either State, Territorial, or municipal authority.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The following amendments recommended by the committee were read:

After the word "Interior," on page 2, line 4, add:

Provided, That the construction of lateral lines from the main pipe line establishing connection with oil and gas wells on the individual allotments of citizens may be constructed without securing authority from the Secretary of the Interior and without filing maps of definite location, when the consent of the allottee upon whose lands oil or gas wells may be located has been obtained by the pipe-line company: *Provided further*, That in case it is desired to run a pipe line under the line of any railroad and satisfactory arrangements can not be made with the railroad company, then the question shall be referred to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which the pipe-line company shall be permitted to lay its lines under said railroad."

Page 2, line 9, after the word "lines," add the word "are," and same line and page strike out the word "are" after the word "not."

On page 2, line 18, after the word "authority," add the following:

"And incorporated cities and towns into and through which such pipe lines may be constructed shall have the power to regulate the manner of construction therein, and nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to deny the right of municipal taxation in such towns and cities, and nothing herein shall authorize the use of such right of way except for pipe line, and then only so far as may be necessary for its construction, maintenance, and care."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas for some explanation. Was this bill reported from a committee of the Senate?

Mr. CURTIS. The bill was considered by a subcommittee of five, consisting of three from the majority side and two from the minority side. The report of the subcommittee was unanimous and was unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Indian Affairs. It has the indorsement of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Was it reported in the Senate by a committee?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir; and passed the Senate some time ago.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It provides for pipe lines, for oil and gas lines?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What does it provide as to payment of damages where it goes through public land?

Mr. CURTIS. The damages are paid to the allottees or the Secretary for use of the tribe in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct. I might state to the gentleman from Indiana that the Secretary of the Interior has made a number of leases to oil and gas companies in the Indian Territory; but when application was made for the right to build pipe lines, he held that under the existing law he had no right to grant any such right of way. There are a hundred wells of gas and oil near Bartlesville, Ind. T., only about forty of which are being operated, and there are forty-six near Chelsea, Ind. T., of which only twenty-five are being worked, because they have no pipe-line facilities. The Government has made leases requiring them to develop the wells, and yet no way has been provided for the operators to get their oil to the refineries, and this bill simply gives the Secretary

the right to grant the right of way so their products may be taken to the market.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] in the way of an amendment to the bill. We are, at least I hope we are, on the eve of admitting Indian Territory and Oklahoma into the Union as States. It does not seem to me wise to bring them in manacled with corporation grants. I would have no objection to this bill, if the gentleman would limit the time of its operation. I do not much care how long, but it seems to me that there ought to be a provision in the bill limiting its operation to twenty years, let us say.

Mr. CURTIS. I would state to the gentleman that such a provision would not be necessary, for the reason that if Oklahoma and the Indian Territory are admitted—and I hope they will be—the reservations will still be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. There is nothing in this bill which will in any way interfere with the rights of the States, the Territories, the townships, the counties, or the cities to levy a tax—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand that, but there is no termination to the life of this easement.

Mr. CURTIS. I am perfectly willing, if the gentleman insists, to make it ten years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; or even twenty years.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will offer that amendment, limiting it to twenty years.

The SPEAKER. The question is first on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please indicate his amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. At the end of section 1 add the following:

Provided, The rights granted herein shall not extend beyond the period of twenty years.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk reported the amendment, as follows:

Insert after line 14, page 3: "*Provided, That the rights herein granted shall not extend beyond the period of twenty years.*"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] what seems to me will be the effect of this amendment in assessing the damage for the right of way. Of course the temporary character of the occupancy will be taken into consideration and the compensation reduced accordingly, while, as a matter of fact, the oil or gas is liable to be exhausted in ten or fourteen years; and the result would be that in making this change you would simply reduce the compensation that the Indian allottee would get without practically doing him or anybody else any good. The easement in its nature is temporary only, and my friend will accomplish what he does not want to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I consider the question of the amount of compensation to be paid as a secondary matter.

Mr. LACEY. The point to which I want to call my friend's attention is this: In the very nature of things, whilst this easement on its face is perpetual, it is in fact temporary, because the production of oil and gas is temporary; consequently there is no danger of the perpetuity of the grant interfering with anybody.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That may or may not be.

Mr. LACEY. It is always so as to gas or oil.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It may be true or it may not be. I do not know as a matter of the science of oil whether it is true in this case or not. But this is true—that you ought not to start this precedent; you ought not to give anybody a perpetual easement of any sort. In all cases of this kind there ought to be a limitation prescribed by law.

It is true that you always reserve in these grants the right to amend or repeal; but it is also true that the right is never exercised. And when you attempt to exercise it people immediately begin to cry out about "vested rights," the violation of the obligation of contracts, and all that.

Now, if the point of the gentleman be correct as a matter of fact, nobody is going to be damaged by limiting the period, because by the end of the period nobody will have need to exercise the right granted by the easement. So I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MUTUAL CLAIMS—UNITED STATES AND VERMONT.

Mr. HASKINS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 113) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the State of Vermont money appropriated by the

act of Congress of July 1, 1902, and to adjust mutual claims between the United States and the State of Vermont.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the State of Vermont the sum appropriated to that State under the act of Congress of July 1, 1902, or such part thereof as it may be entitled to, the accounting officers of the Treasury Department are hereby authorized and directed to audit, adjust, and settle the mutual claims of the United States and the State of Vermont in respect to ordnance and quartermaster's stores furnished in the years 1864 and 1865, and on payment a receipt in full shall be taken from the proper State authorities.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HASKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER NEAR ST. JOSEPH.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3720) now on the Speaker's table be taken up for present consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 3720) to authorize the St. Joseph and Grand Island Railway Company, in the reconstruction of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Joseph, Mo., to lower said bridge and to shorten the draw spans thereof.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be lawful for the St. Joseph and Grand Island Railway Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the States of Kansas and Nebraska, in reconstructing the bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Joseph, Mo., the construction of which was authorized by act of Congress approved March 5, 1872, to so reconstruct said bridge that the vertical clearance shall not be less than 29 feet 3 inches above low-water mark and not less than 9 feet 3 inches above high-water mark, and that said spans on each side of the central pivot pier of the draw shall be not less than 133 feet in length.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill similar to the Senate bill just passed will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

DONATION OF GUN CARRIAGES.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill No. 3800, and that the same be now taken up for consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 3800) donating gun carriages to the Connecticut commissioners for the care and preservation of Fort Griswold.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to deliver, if the same can be done without detriment to the Government, to the commissioners appointed by the governor of the State of Connecticut for the care and preservation of the Fort Griswold tract for the purpose of a public park, as provided for in the act of Congress approved June 6, 1902 (vol. 32, pt. 1, Stat. L., p. 306), four barbette carriages for 8-inch Rodman gun, front pintle, and one barbette carriage for 24-pounder rifle, front pintle.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BRANDEGEE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LAND GRANT TO PORT ANGELES, WASH.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9777) granting to the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, for park purposes certain portions of the Government reserve in said city.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and there is hereby, granted to the city of Port Angeles, in the county of Clallam, in the State of Washington, to be used as a public park, suburban blocks 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 182, 183, 184, containing, approximately, 320 acres, now embraced within the Government reserve in said city, and authority is hereby given for the issuance of a patent to said city of Port Angeles for said lands to be used for park purposes.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Public Lands were read, as follows:

Strike out all after the word "eighteen," in line 10, on page 1, down to and including the word "fifty," in line 2 on page 2.

Strike out all after the word "fifty-five," line 5, page 2, to the end of line 9 on said page.

In line 10 strike out the word "three" and insert "one," and also strike out the words "and twenty" in said line.

In line 11 strike out the words "reserve in" and insert the words "town site of."

After the word "purposes," in line 14, add the following: "and in the event the same shall not be used for public-park purposes for a period of five successive years the same shall revert to the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Washington how much land is proposed here to be granted?

Mr. JONES of Washington. About 100 acres.

Mr. PAYNE. How much of a place is Port Angeles?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There are about fifteen hundred or two thousand inhabitants. This land was an original town site laid out by the Government, consisting of three or four thou-

sand lots; and no provision was made at that time for the dedication of any part of the land to park purposes. A part of this land was laid out in 1863. These are suburban lots, outside of the business part of the city and outside of the land which was platted into small business and residence lots. Those lots have been on the market since 1895, and only one of the blocks has been sold since that time. The land is of very little value for any other purpose than as a park. A portion of it has been reserved for military purposes; but the remainder, as I have just stated, has been on the market for sale since 1895, and only one block has been sold.

Mr. PAYNE. In other words, town lots are not in great demand there?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; not at that point. The present grant comprises only about 100 acres, and the use of the land is restricted to park purposes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. It is true, is it not, that the Government has already received from the sale of lands in this town site something like \$80,000?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Something over \$100,000—the original town site.

Mr. MONDELL. So that the Government is in to the extent of about \$100,000 now on this town site?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; to the good.

Mr. MONDELL. And this is simply transferring some of the poorer outlying lots to the town for a park?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. The policy is, I suppose, that the Government should never in any case be allowed to make a dollar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Government has already made a hundred thousand dollars out of it and can not make anything more, and this is simply to let the people have a little benefit in the way of a park for recreation purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill read as amended?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill and amendments will be again reported.

The bill as proposed to be amended was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JONES of Washington, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is notified by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] that he will be unavoidably absent for several days to come, and he asks to be excused from service upon conference committees on sundry pension bills. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions [Mr. SULLOWAY] in place of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD], excused.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the report on the naval appropriation bill, with permission to correct a few clerical mistakes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the report on the naval appropriation bill, with permission to correct certain clerical errors. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and pending that motion, I desire to ask my colleague [Mr. MEYER of Louisiana], representing the minority, what time he wishes on that side for general debate?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Five hours on a side.

Mr. FOSS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that general debate be agreed upon at five hours on each side, making ten hours in all, one half to be controlled by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER], and the other half to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate on the naval appropriation bill be closed after ten hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. FOSS was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12220) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, with Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state for the information of the committee that I have prepared, or tried to prepare, a very careful report, giving, as far as I could, an explanation for the increases in this bill.

The bill as now before the committee carries an appropriation of \$96,338,038.94. The estimates sent to the committee, made up in the Navy Department, amounted in all, original and supplemental estimates, to the sum of \$105,962,844.34. This bill shows a reduction from those estimates of \$9,624,805.40.

I recall the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HEMENWAY], in the earlier days of this session of Congress, said that if we appropriated for all the estimates asked for by the different departments of the Government there would be a deficiency of nearly \$40,000,000.

Up to the time that this bill was reported from the committee there had been reported to the House six great appropriation bills—the pension, the legislative, executive, and judicial, the army, the urgent deficiency, the diplomatic and consular, and the agricultural appropriation bills. The reduction from the estimates in these bills amounted in round numbers to about \$5,600,000. The reductions from the estimates in this bill amount to \$9,624,805.40. So I think this bill will afford some comfort to the Committee on Appropriations—that school of economists who exercise a watchful care over the appropriation bills of other committees as well, of course, as their own. And while it will afford comfort to the economists, at the same time it affords inspiration to those who believe in the policy of building up the American Navy, because, while this bill reduces the estimates by an amount of nearly \$10,000,000, it is also an increase over the appropriation bill of last year of more than \$14,000,000.

That is made necessary by the fact that we are increasing the number of men and also providing for the continued construction of our ships already authorized. Take, for instance, the matter of the increase of men. We provide in this bill for an increase of 3,000 men. We ought really to provide for more men; but we have not the facilities for training them at the present time. The increase in the pay of the Navy from this fact, and from the increase in the number of officers and the increase in the number of midshipmen in the Naval Academy, amounts to more than a million and a half dollars.

There is another increase in this bill over that of last year which I desire to call your attention to, and that is the fact that we are rebuilding the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Last year we made no appropriation, because no appropriation was required. There was enough money on hand to provide for the expenditures of the present fiscal year, but in this bill we make an appropriation of \$3,000,000. Then, too, we provide for an increase of nearly \$5,000,000 for construction and repair. That applies to the construction of ships which have already been authorized. We also provide an increase over that of last year of \$2,000,000 for armor. In this bill we are making an appropriation for our naval station down at Guantanamo of \$385,000; then we are making an appropriation for our naval station over in Subig Bay, in the Philippine Islands, to the amount of \$362,395.

These are the large increases in this bill, and go to make up that increase over last year in the appropriation bill of more than \$14,000,000.

Now, there are some other matters to which I desire to call the attention of the committee. The committee recommends for its naval programme for this year the authorization of one first-class battle ship, carrying the heaviest armor and the most powerful ordnance for a vessel of this class, on a trial displacement of not more than 16,000 tons, to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action. This battle ship will cost \$7,775,000. The committee also recommends two first-class armored cruisers of not more than 14,500 tons trial displacement, carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful armament for vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action.

Each one of these armored cruisers will cost \$6,500,000. The committee also recommends the authorization of three scout cruisers of not more than 3,750 tons of trial displacement, carrying the most powerful armament for vessels of their class, to have

the highest practicable speed compatible with good cruising qualities and great radius of action. Each one of these vessels or cruisers will cost \$2,200,000. And in addition thereto two colliers, to be capable of accompanying the battle fleet, carrying 5,000 tons of cargo coal loaded, and having a trial speed of not less than 16 knots, each costing \$1,250,000. The total cost of the battle ship, two armored cruisers, three scout cruisers, and two colliers will be \$29,885,000. In this appropriation bill we make no appropriation for this programme authorized this year, because it is not necessary to do so. The appropriation for the cost of these vessels will extend over a series of years, beginning next year, and covering possibly five or six years.

This naval programme which the committee recommends this year is, in its judgment, a modest and reasonable programme, when you come to take into consideration what other countries are doing, and I may say to the committee that I have prepared here in this report a statement showing the naval programme for this year of some of the leading countries of the world. England, for instance, is building three battle ships, four armored cruisers, three protected cruisers of the third class, four scouts, fifteen torpedo-boat destroyers, and ten submarines. Germany has authorized for its naval programme this year two battle ships of 13,000 tons each, one armored cruiser of 9,500 tons, three cruisers of 3,000 tons, one gunboat, six high-sea torpedo boats. Russia has a large naval programme this year of two battle ships of 16,500 tons, two battle ships also of 12,000 tons, two armored cruisers of 6,500 tons; and Italy has a large programme.

In view of that, I think that this programme which we recommend this year is nothing more than a fair and reasonable programme, and I believe that it will be heartily approved throughout the country. If the committee desires to know the strength of foreign navies as they stand to-day, they will find it upon the last pages of this report, in which, by the aid of the Bureau of Naval Intelligence, I have placed here an illustrative diagram, showing the war-ship tonnage of the principal naval powers. Great Britain has a tonnage of a little over a million and a half—I mean to-day in commission; France, nearly 600,000 tons; Russia, a little over 400,000 tons; Germany, a little less than 400,000 tons; the United States, a little less than 300,000 tons; Italy, a little less than ours; Japan, a little less than Italy, and Austria last. I am speaking of the Navy as it stands to-day, the Navy serviceable. This diagram also shows how much the foreign countries are building. As the Navy stands to-day, based upon the ships already built, we rank fifth. Great Britain ranks first, France second, Russia third, Germany fourth.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said in some quarters that we ought to stop building up the American Navy, that the Navy is large enough, that we have too many ships already. That voice has come to us, but I do not believe that it is the voice of the American people. It has been said that we ought to spend more money on internal improvements, that we ought to deepen our rivers and harbors, that we ought to erect post-office buildings, that we ought to promote expositions; that that was a wiser expenditure of public money; but, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with that position. There is no necessity for ever drawing the issue between building up the American Navy and providing proper and needful expenditures for internal improvements. I recall the fact that during the last six or seven years, as every Member of this House will recall the fact, that we have been building up the American Navy faster than ever before, but at the same time we have also been expending more money upon internal improvements than ever before.

Why, since the Government began we have expended \$450,000,000 for the deepening of our rivers and harbors, and yet since the 4th of March, 1897—and I take that simply as a convenient time—we have appropriated \$150,000,000 of that \$450,000,000. Not only that, but we have made greater appropriations for building post-offices during that period than ever before, we have promoted more expositions than ever before, and yet I say during all this time we have been making greater progress in the construction of the American Navy than ever before. There is no necessity of drawing the line between the Navy and internal improvements. This country is rich enough and great enough to make proper appropriations for necessary needs at home and abroad, but, sir, if the issue shall be drawn between building up the American Navy as it stands to-day and putting our money into deepening rivers and harbors and building post-offices and promoting expositions—I say if that issue should ever be drawn, though there is no necessity for it, I have no question as to where the American people will stand. Foremost and above all must stand considerations of national defense, the maintenance of our foreign policy, and the protection of American citizens all over the globe.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Navy of ours is not costing so very much when you come to take into consideration our population, our wealth, and our expenditures of public money. Last year our appropriation amounted to about \$82,000,000, about \$1 per capita for

every man, woman, and child in the country. On the basis of per capita it is not large. Take it, for instance, on the basis of our foreign trade. Our foreign trade last year, if I remember rightly, amounted to two and one-half billion dollars. On the basis, for instance, of appropriating one hundred millions for the Navy, it would mean only 4 per cent of our foreign trade.

Take it on the basis of expenditures. Our expenditures for all the different Departments of the Government will amount, in round numbers, to \$700,000,000; perhaps, to be a little more accurate, \$660,000,000. Placing it on the basis of spending \$100,000,000 on the Navy, that would be about 14 per cent of our total expenditures. This is not as large a proportion as we expended on the Navy in 1800. In that year the naval expenditures were 29 per cent of the total expenditures, according to a statement prepared for me. In 1820 we expended 20 per cent of the total expenditures on the Navy. In 1840, 21 per cent. In 1870 only 7 per cent. That was when our Navy had been allowed to go to pieces after the civil war. In 1880 we expended, I believe, even less than that, because then we had for a Navy only thirty-two old hulks left over from the civil war.

Then we stood twentieth among the navies of the world. We had a smaller navy even than little Chile, in South America. But it was then that the country awoke to the fact that it was necessary to build up the American Navy, and then started the onward march of its growth and development. It began under the Administration of President Arthur and has continued to the present day. Our naval expenditures in 1900 amounted to about 8 per cent of our total expenditures.

To-day, even if we should increase this bill to one hundred millions, the percentage would be about 14 per cent of our total expenditures, less than our forefathers appropriated, in percentage, one hundred years ago.

Now, take it, for instance, on a larger and broader scale—on the wealth of the country. Treat, if you please, the American Navy as the insurer of American wealth, and where do we stand? It has been estimated that the total wealth of this country is more than \$100,000,000,000. If we should appropriate in this bill \$100,000,000 for the American Navy, what percentage would that be of the total wealth of our country? One-tenth of 1 per cent. The Secretary of the Navy in a very able report has set forth how cheaply we have insured ourselves during the past century with the American Navy.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Would the gentleman from Illinois object to an interruption?

Mr. FOSS. No.

Mr. LAWRENCE. It would be interesting to know why the Committee on Naval Affairs recommended the construction of but one battle ship and two armored cruisers. Is that in accord with the recommendation of the Navy Department?

Mr. FOSS. The recommendation of the general board was along that line, of more cruisers this year than battle ships. The gentleman will recollect that last year we authorized five large battle ships and no cruisers, but the sentiment of the naval authorities seemed to be that this year we should authorize a larger number of cruisers.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Is it the opinion of the Navy Department that there should be a certain proportion existing between the number of battle ships and the number of armored cruisers?

Mr. FOSS. There is an opinion, and the opinion is this: That we ought to have about half as many armored cruisers as battle ships. To-day we have twenty-four battle ships built or under construction, and we have to-day ten armored cruisers. With the two armored cruisers authorized in this bill, it will give us twelve, and we will have just about one-half as many armored cruisers as we have battle ships.

Mr. RIXEY. Will my colleague allow me to make a statement in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will address the Chair.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to interrupt the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FOSS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. RIXEY. I only wanted to suggest the fact brought out in the question by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which was as to the recommendation of the Navy Department. As I understand it, it was for one battle ship, one armored cruiser, and three protected cruisers. The bill carries one battle ship, two armored cruisers, and no protected cruisers.

Mr. FOSS. We left off the protected cruisers, and in their place put one armored cruiser. Admiral Dewey was of the opinion that we ought to build more fighting ships than the general board recommended, and for that reason the committee made that change and substituted in place of the three protected cruisers one armored cruiser.

There is one thing that we ought always to keep in mind—you can not build a navy in time of war. When war comes you must fight. What would Russia give to-day if she could have her sunken ships? But it is no time now for her to build navies. The war is on. In time of peace you must build for the time of national emergency and of national crisis. It has been said that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." It might also be said, and I think I have read it somewhere, that eternal preparation for war is the price of peace.

There is another thing that we ought to take into consideration, that is, the great difference between the Army and the Navy. The Army consists largely of personnel. You can call into being a great army in comparatively a short time. Men will come from the field and farm and the office, and in a few months, under proper training and discipline, you will have a well-organized army ready for the march to the front. That is because an army is made up largely of personnel. And after the war is over these men will go back and be lost in the citizenship of the land.

But with a navy it is different. You must realize that there are two things which constitute a navy—not only personnel, but also matériel. It costs five or six years to build these great battle ships. They can be built only in time of peace. It takes longer to train seamen than to train soldiers. Someone has said, and there is a great element of truth in the remark, that you can make a major-general by the stroke of your pen, but it takes forty years to make an admiral.

By reason of this difference between an army and a navy it behooves the American people to continue this splendid policy of building up its Navy, so that we may be prepared for war whenever that hour shall come. God forbid that it ever shall come, but it will come—until we reach that stage of civilization when—

The war drums shall beat no longer
And the battle flags be furled
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world.

But that time has not come now.

There is another thing to which I want to call your attention, and that is the fact that we are largely getting the men for the Navy away out in the western country. They are coming from all the States of the American Union, but they are coming in larger numbers to-day from the great West. For instance, last year we enlisted from the State of Colorado, 390 men; from Illinois, 733; from Indiana, 417; from Iowa, 150; from Kansas, 112; from Kentucky, 94; from Michigan, 285; from Minnesota, 113; from Missouri, 904; from Nebraska, 101; from Ohio, 572; from Wisconsin, 187. And from the farther West they come. That is where we are getting the men for the Navy to-day. And they are making the best seamen. What we need more than anything else, perchance, to-day are facilities for the proper training of our men. We have a training station in the East, on the Atlantic coast, and one in the West, on the Pacific, but we need a training station on the Great Lakes for the training of these men, because out of the great Middle West they come; and according to naval authorities they bring with them the best bone and sinew and make the best trained seamen and gunners and machinists on board our great ships to-day.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to say much to this committee as to the necessity of building up the American Navy. Congress has been liberal in the past, and I take it that the policy is pretty well settled that the growth of our Navy shall continue. We have interests which necessitate a good-sized navy. We have a great coast line to protect. You may say that we are isolated on this hemisphere and do not need a navy. That was the argument of years ago, but it is not an argument of to-day. It is an obsolete argument, because science is annihilating space every day. The crossing of the Atlantic or the Pacific is no longer a question of weeks, but is a question of days. The ships are moving faster and faster across the bosom of the ocean. Not only that, but foreign nations have established coaling stations near our coast. So the old argument that we are isolated on this hemisphere and therefore need only a small navy is fast being relegated to the rear.

Now, there is another thing. There are some interests on this hemisphere that we are bound to protect. We had a little trouble recently down here in Santo Domingo. An engineer on board of one of our ships was shot by the insurgents without provocation. I do not know how soon, but the time may come when we shall have to step in and say to Santo Domingo and Haiti, "If you can not preserve law and order within your own territorial confines, then the United States will step in and do it for you."

And then, too, we are building here upon this hemisphere the Panama Canal—a mighty work which will bring two great oceans into everlasting fellowship—and we will need a defense for that canal. We have provided here in this bill for appropriations to the extent of \$350,000 for a naval base down at Guantanamo, right on the road to Panama. So we have that interest to look after. And then we have the larger interest of the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. I desire to call your attention to a speech which the President made, I think, in my city, relative to the

necessity of building up a strong navy for the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. Says he:

If we are not prepared to back up words by deeds, it is far better to omit the words. I believe in the Monroe doctrine with all my heart. I believe in asserting it, because I believe the American people are willing to back it up. But it can never be backed up by words alone. If it became the interest of some great power to violate it, most assuredly that great power would do so if it was thought that we would only bluster and threaten, or if it was believed our force was too weak to be formidable in a fight. A good navy is absolutely essential if we intend to treat the Monroe doctrine as we should treat it—that is, as the cardinal feature of our foreign policy. The fleet is in a peculiar sense the property of the nation as a whole. Every American, whether inland or on the seacoast, if he is both farsighted and patriotic, should be peculiarly jealous of the efficiency of the Navy. It would be the right arm of the country in the event of foreign trouble. Disaster to it would send a thrill of mortal anguish through the heart of every good citizen; and the triumphs won by it would in the future, as they have in the past, make every American hold his head higher with pride and joy. The Navy must be built up, and it must be continually exercised and trained, so that the officers and men may attain the highest degree of excellence in handling the great war engines intrusted to their care.

And I may say upon this point that the American Navy was never as efficient as it is to-day. The men were never as efficient. We have at the head of the Bureau of Navigation Admiral Taylor, who has given a great deal of time and attention toward the training of our men. Our marksmanship is better than ever before, and I say this because I know the distinguished Chairman of this Committee of the Whole [Mr. HEPBURN] has always been in favor of good marksmanship. On previous naval appropriation bills he has called the matter to the attention of the committee. Being a good shot himself, he wants our gunners to be good marksmen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have called your attention to the necessity for continuing this policy of building up our Navy—some of the great necessities which we have here at home on this hemisphere, where we are supreme.

But we have also interests in the Far East. This country is no longer an isolated country. We have the Philippines over there in the other hemisphere, which we must protect. We are charged with them. I care not whether gentlemen upon the other side may have been opposed to that policy or not, but the American people have set their approval upon it, and it is not necessary for us to go back and consider the question whether it was wise that we should hold the Philippines or not. We are there; they are ours, ours to protect.

We appropriate in this bill \$862,000 for a naval base over in Subig Bay, with no other purpose than that in view, to protect the Philippine Islands, and also at the same time to protect our other large interests in that hemisphere.

Our commerce with the Orient to-day is growing with every hour. We are selling more goods to China than we have ever sold her before. In that far-off hemisphere lie the great markets of the future, the markets for our South, the markets for our North, the markets for our East, and the markets for our West. We need a navy over there to protect our commerce and our trade.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but we need a navy as well to back up our diplomacy. And I may say to you that American diplomacy never stood so high as it stands to-day under John Hay. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no nation in all the world whose influence and power are felt so much in that far-off hemisphere as ours.

Why, you recall the trouble in China two or three years ago when the foreign countries would have dismembered the Chinese Empire if they could have done so. It was a note from this country that preserved its integrity. And only recently our Secretary of State sent a note to the foreign powers suggesting the localization of the theater of war. That means, first, the neutrality of China in the war which is now going on, and secondly, the integrity of China; and though to-day we are 7,000 miles away from China, yet we are nearer to the heart of China than any country in the world.

Gentlemen, I am not in favor of building up the Navy spasmodically, with a great naval programme this year and none next. I am not in favor of a policy that will waft us one way to-day and to-morrow another. I am in favor of a policy along reasonable and statesmanlike lines, a policy of gradual development and construction. I do not want a navy to brag about or to bluster with.

I do not want a navy for any of those purposes, but I want to see our country strong enough upon the sea to ever maintain that calmness and that poise which becometh a great nation and a great people; a little slow to anger, a little plenteous in mercy, but when she strikes may she ever have the power to strike as Dewey struck at Manila—for the flag and victory! [Loud applause.]

APPENDIX.

[House Report No. 205, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

February 11, 1904, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Foss, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 12220):

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred so much of the President's annual message as relates to the naval establishment, together with the annual estimates of the Navy Department, submit herewith a bill

(H. R. 12220) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, with the following statement:

The amount carried by this bill is \$96,338,038.94.
The original estimates of the Department amounted to \$102,866,449.34, to which were added supplemental estimates to the amount of \$3,096,385, making in all complete estimates to the amount of \$105,962,834.34.

The committee, after a careful consideration of these estimates, made deductions to the amount of \$9,624,805.40, leaving a balance of \$96,338,038.94, which sum is hereby appropriated in this bill.

The appropriation act of last year carried \$81,876,791.43, while this bill carries, as above stated, an increase of \$14,461,247.51.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, the estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill for the several bureaus and divisions of the naval establishment:

Naval establishment.	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Pay of the Navy.....	\$17,706,099.00	\$19,824,093.00	\$19,324,093.00
Pay, miscellaneous.....	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
Contingent, Navy.....	15,000.00	15,000.00	65,000.00
Emergency fund.....	25,000.00	50,000.00	-----
Bureau of Navigation.....	1,320,723.00	1,363,886.00	1,360,028.00
Bureau of Ordnance.....	3,016,006.75	3,776,706.75	3,676,706.75
Bureau of Equipment.....	5,418,602.52	6,497,908.00	6,498,028.00
Bureau of Yards and Docks.....	748,903.70	922,884.57	913,790.92
Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks.....	4,336,440.00	8,164,874.00	6,565,571.00
Guantanamo.....	100,000.00	-----	-----
Public works, Bureau of Navigation:			
Repairs, Naval Academy.....	60,000.00	-----	-----
Naval Academy.....	500.00	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
Naval training station, California.....	4,250.00	19,000.00	19,000.00
Naval training station, Rhode Island.....	232,000.00	14,000.00	14,000.00
Naval War College.....	-----	8,125.00	8,125.00
Naval training station, Great Lakes.....	-----	250,000.00	250,000.00
Public works, Bureau of Ordnance.....	82,800.00	248,900.00	318,900.00
Public works, Bureau of Equipment.....	5,000.00	7,800.00	7,800.00
Public works, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	245,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	265,000.00	360,000.00	375,000.00
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.....	4,333,978.34	5,203,932.28	5,203,932.28
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	8,367,024.25	8,595,824.25	8,595,824.25
Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	3,907,900.00	3,572,900.00	3,572,900.00
Naval Academy.....	270,397.34	314,588.46	311,706.46
Marine Corps:			
Paymaster.....	2,097,778.03	2,118,875.53	2,120,476.78
Quartermaster.....	1,672,756.50	1,690,296.50	1,690,296.50
Increase of the Navy:			
Submarines.....	500,000.00	-----	-----
Construction and machinery.....	15,025,632.00	23,826,860.00	19,826,860.00
Armor and armament.....	10,000,000.00	12,000,000.00	12,000,000.00
Equipment.....	400,000.00	400,000.00	-----
Grand total.....	81,876,791.43	102,866,449.34	96,338,038.94

The first general heading in the bill is that for "Pay of the Navy," and the following table is a comparative statement showing the amount appropriated last year, the estimates for the fiscal year 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Pay of the Navy.....	\$17,706,099.00	\$19,824,093.00	\$19,324,093.00
Pay, miscellaneous.....	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
Contingent, Navy.....	15,000.00	15,000.00	65,000.00
Emergency fund.....	25,000.00	50,000.00	-----

The first paragraph calls for an appropriation of \$19,324,093 for the pay and allowances of officers and men. This is made up from the following table:

Pay of 2,437 officers on the active list now allowed by law.....	\$5,545,407
Commutation of quarters for officers.....	200,000
Pay of 983 midshipmen under instruction.....	491,500
Pay of 615 officers on the retired list.....	1,499,748
Extra pay of 104 retired officers performing active duty.....	38,650
Pay of 168 clerks now allowed by law (Rev. Stat. sec. 1556).....	208,900
Pay of 31,500 petty officers, seamen, and other enlisted men.....	11,020,320
Pay of 2,500 apprentice boys at training stations and on board training ships.....	270,000
Pay of enlisted men on the retired list.....	72,000
Extra pay of petty officers and seamen reenlisting under honorable discharge.....	204,212
Allowances to graduates of gun captains', seamen-gunnery', and petty officers' schools.....	22,143
Allowances to men holding good-conduct medals.....	83,589
To pay interest on deposits by enlisted men, act February 9, 1889.....	20,000
Extra pay for gun pointers and gun captains.....	147,624
Total.....	19,824,093

While the estimate as submitted by the Department called for \$500,000 more than the appropriation recommended in this bill, yet the committee felt that the deduction might safely be made, as from experience in the past it has been found that the quota of men has seldom, if ever, been full. This is an increase of \$1,617,994 over that appropriated last year, which is due to the increased number of officers, midshipmen, and men, there being 3,000 additional men provided for in this bill.

The appropriation for "Pay, miscellaneous" is the same as that of last year, \$600,000.

The contingent fund is increased from \$15,000 to \$65,000 by reason of the fact that the emergency fund has been consolidated with it, for the reason that it is more properly a contingent fund.

The emergency fund arose out of the Spanish-American war, and the high-

est amounts appropriated under it were \$300,000 in a single year, and the responsibility for its expenditure was placed entirely upon the President; but now that the fund has been reduced to \$50,000 and the character of expenditures under it necessarily having changed, it is believed that there is no reason for charging the expenditure of this fund to the President, but that it ought to be left to the Secretary of the Navy, and accordingly it merges into the contingent fund, with this limitation thereon:

"Provided, That the accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow, in the settlement of the accounts of disbursing officers involved, payments made under the appropriation 'Contingent, Navy,' to civilian employees appointed by the Navy Department for duty in and serving at naval stations maintained in the island possessions during the fiscal year 1905, and until such time as Congress shall make specific appropriation for the pay of such employees."

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

This Bureau has general jurisdiction over the officers and men of the Navy, their training and assignment; also the movement of vessels in the Navy and their complement of officers and men. It has charge of the compilation of the Naval Register and preparation, revision, and enforcement of all tactics, drill books, signal codes, cipher codes, and the uniform regulations. It also has general supervision of the Naval Academy and technical school for officers (except the War College and torpedo school).

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and amounts recommended by this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimated, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Navigation:			
Transportation.....	\$221,429.00	\$257,858.00	\$254,000.00
Recruiting.....	88,571.00	97,141.00	97,141.00
Contingent.....	27,679.00	30,358.00	30,358.00
Gunnery exercises.....	120,000.00	120,000.00	120,000.00
Outfits on first enlistment.....	450,000.00	450,000.00	450,000.00
Maintenance of colliers.....	229,500.00	224,604.00	224,604.00
Naval training station, California.....	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
Naval training station, Rhode Island.....	55,000.00	55,000.00	55,000.00
Lectures and entertainments for apprentices.....	-----	1,000.00	-----
Naval War College, Rhode Island—			
Maintenance of Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island and care of grounds for same.....	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00
One draftsman.....	1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00
Services of a lecturer on international law.....	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Services of civilian lecturers.....	600.00	600.00	600.00
Purchase of books of reference.....	400.00	400.00	400.00
United States Naval Home.....	77,344.00	76,725.00	76,725.00
One matron, increase \$360 to \$420 per annum.....	-----	-----	-----
One attendant, new, at \$240 per annum.....	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	1,320,723.00	1,363,886.00	1,360,028.00

As will be seen from above table, the appropriation for this Bureau is practically the same as that of last year, there being a slight increase of \$39,305.

This is substantially accounted for by the increase in the appropriation for transportation and recruiting. There is a limitation on the appropriation for contingent which allows a part of this appropriation to be used for the transportation of effects of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy.

The appropriations for gunnery exercises and outfits on first enlistments are the same as that of last year.

The appropriation for the maintenance of colliers has been decreased by \$4,896, and results from the fact that it is proposed to man eleven of the twenty colliers with naval officers and enlisted men at the beginning of the next fiscal year, and it may be said that it is the intention to man remaining colliers in the same manner as rapidly as the exigencies of the service will permit.

The appropriation recommended for the maintenance of the naval training station in California is the same as that of last year.

The appropriation for the maintenance of the naval training station at Rhode Island is increased \$1,000, due to the recommendation of that sum in providing lectures and suitable entertainments for the apprentices.

The appropriation recommended for the Naval War College, Rhode Island, is the same as that of last year.

The appropriation for the Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., is substantially the same.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

This Bureau has general charge of the ordnance of the Navy and the armor and armament of vessels, the torpedo station and magazines on shore, and designs the interior arrangements of all buildings erected for its use at navy-yards, as well as the machinery used for handling ammunition on ship, the interior of the turrets and the arrangement of guns, and the distribution of armor thereon. All torpedoes, powder, guns, and war explosives of all kinds, and armor plate are bought and manufactured under its supervision. It has control of all details of its own administration.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and amounts carried by this bill.

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Ordnance:			
Ordnance and ordnance stores—			
Procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material.....	\$1,500,000.00	\$2,000,000.00	\$2,000,000.00
Reserve supply of ammunition.....	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
Conversion of 6-inch guns to rapid fire.....	25,000.00	-----	-----
Smokeless powder, purchase and manufacture of.....	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
To enlarge smokeless-powder factory at Indian Head, Md.....	55,000.00	-----	-----
Machine tools for navy-yard, Boston.....	-----	5,000.00	5,000.00
Machine tools for navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H.....	-----	4,000.00	4,000.00
Machine tools for torpedo station, Newport, R. I.....	-----	5,000.00	5,000.00
Machine tools for naval magazine, Lake Denmark, N. J.....	-----	2,000.00	2,000.00

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Ordnance—Continued.			
Ordnance and ordnance stores—Continued.			
At Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.—			
Boiler plant and accessories therefor	\$80,000.00		
Steel-casting plant, extension of	5,000.00		
Converting gun lathes from steam to electric	25,000.00		
For a 15-ton wrecking car		\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00
Machinery for existing shops	50,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
Repairs to boiler plant		8,000.00	8,000.00
Repairs to cranes, machinery, locomotives, etc.		10,000.00	10,000.00
Fifteen days' leave of absence to employees		100,000.00	
For navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal.—			
Purchase and installation of cranes in building No. 111		13,200.00	13,200.00
Reserve guns for auxiliary cruisers		125,000.00	125,000.00
Reserve guns for ships of the Navy		125,000.00	125,000.00
New battery for New York Torpedo station—	100,000.00		
Labor, material, and routine expenses	65,000.00	65,000.00	65,000.00
Naval militia	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
Repairs—			
To magazines, buildings, machinery, etc.	80,000.00	80,000.00	80,000.00
Miscellaneous—			
Freight, transportation, etc.	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Civil establishment	46,006.75	47,006.75	47,006.75
Increase in pay of assistant chemist, naval proving ground, \$1,600 to \$2,000			
Increase in pay of two foremen at Naval Gun Factory (\$300 each), \$2,200 to \$2,500			
Total	3,116,006.75	3,776,706.75	3,676,706.75

The increase in the appropriation for this Bureau over last year is \$560,700. There is an increase for ordnance and ordnance stores of \$500,000, \$100,000 for new machinery at the Washington Gun Factory, and smaller items for tools, etc., at the navy-yard, and also \$125,000 for reserve guns for auxiliary cruisers, and \$125,000 for reserve guns for ships of the Navy. These last two items have usually been carried in previous appropriation bills until last year, when they were not recommended because there was already sufficient money heretofore appropriated to carry on the work for the present fiscal year, but now it becomes important to appropriate for them again.

The increase in the items for ordnance and ordnance stores can be explained by the fact that we are putting more ships into commission, which necessitates a larger expenditure than previously. A large part of this appropriation is used for target practice. Target practice for a first-class battle ship costs in the neighborhood of \$40,000 to \$45,000 per year. If we have but two practices a year, as now, the cost will be approximately \$1,366,000. When all the ships now building are in commission it will cost \$2,700,000. This may seem to be a large expense, and yet none can be more essential, for, to put it in the terse language of the President, "The only shots that count are the shots that hit."

The other items under this Bureau, for torpedo station at Newport; arming and equipping the Naval Militia; repairs, Bureau of Ordnance; miscellaneous, and civil establishment, are the same as those of last year, except there is an increase recommended in the salaries of the two foremen at the gun factory of \$300 each, and an increase of \$400 in the salary of the assistant chemist at the powder factory. These are strongly recommended by the Chief of the Bureau.

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT.

The duties of this Bureau consist in furnishing the coal and general equipment of vessels. It also has charge of the manufacture of rope, anchors, cables, rigging, sails, galleys, and cooking utensils, and a portion of the electrical machinery for ships; also of the Naval Observatory, Nautical Almanac, and compass offices and all details of its own administration.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Equipment:			
Equipment of vessels	\$2,750,000.00	\$3,000,000.00	\$3,000,000.00
Coal and transportation	2,500,000.00	2,750,000.00	2,750,000.00
Contingent equipment	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Ocean and lake surveys	100,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Depots for coal		600,000.00	600,000.00
Civil establishment	33,602.52	37,903.00	38,028.00
Navy-yard, Boston, Mass.—			
One civil superintendent of chain shop (new)			
One civil superintendent of anchor shop (new)			
Naval station, Cavite, P. I.—			
Master electrician, increase of pay (\$5.04 to \$6 per day)			
Total	5,418,602.52	6,497,903.00	6,498,028.00

As will be seen by the above table, there is an increase in the above appropriations recommended over those of last year of \$1,079,425.48, which can be explained:

First. By the increase of \$250,000 in the equipment of vessels made necessary by the completion of the new ships.

Second. By the insertion of an appropriation for \$200,000 for depots for coal. This appropriation has always been carried in the bill, but was left out last year on account of the large unexpended balance in the Treasury for this object. The Secretary is authorized under existing law to use this appropriation for the establishment of coaling depots at such places as he may

deem necessary. Under this provision a depot for coal will be established at Guantanamo, Cuba, during the present fiscal year.

Third. An increase of \$250,000 in the appropriation for the purchase of coal and other fuel, made necessary by the increased number of new ships, and also because we are using oil for fuel as well as coal.

The appropriation recommended for the contingent fund of this Bureau is the same as that of last year.

The appropriation for ocean and lake surveys is reduced \$25,000.

There is an increase of \$125 in the salary of the superintendent of the ropewalk at Boston (Mass.) Navy-Yard. There are also two new positions provided for—one a civil superintendent of the chain shop, \$2,000, and a civil superintendent of the anchor shop, \$2,000. These two positions are recommended in consequence of the inability of the Department to detail naval officers for this purpose.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

This is the civil engineering bureau of the Department, and has charge of the construction of buildings and their maintenance in the several navy-yards, also of all docks and shore structures of all kinds, such as quay walls, wharves, etc., for which it estimates. It also has charge of all topographical improvements in such yards: Newport, R. I., Annapolis, Md., and the naval home, Philadelphia, the magazines and hospitals outside of navy-yards and the buildings for which it does not estimate being excepted from its jurisdiction. The part of the naval appropriation bill under public works is estimated for by this Bureau.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Yards and Docks:			
Maintenance, yards and docks	\$600,000.00	\$665,000.00	\$725,000.00
Pay of men on leave		60,000.00	
Contingent, Bureau of Yards and Docks	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
Civil establishment—			
Navy-yard, Boston, Mass.	9,831.25	12,042.89	12,042.89
One stenographer and typewriter, at \$3.28 per diem			
One bookkeeper			
Naval station, Cavite, P. I.	2,460.00	3,330.00	3,360.00
One clerk, commandant's office			
One messenger, commandant's office			
Navy-yard, Charleston, S. C.		9,093.65	
One clerk, civil engineer's office			
One writer			
One draftsman in charge			
One stenographer and typewriter, at \$2.80 per diem			
One mail messenger, at \$2 per diem, including Sundays			
One messenger and janitor, at \$1.76 per diem, including Sundays			
One rodman and inspector, at \$3.20 per diem			
One master of tugs			
One messenger to commandant, at \$2 per diem			
Naval station, Guam		3,800.00	3,800.00
One clerk			
One foreman machinist			
One messenger and janitor			
Naval station, Hawaii	1,749.25	1,747.25	1,747.25
Naval station, Key West, Fla.	600.00	2,642.40	2,642.40
One clerk			
One messenger and janitor, at \$1.76 per diem			
Navy-yard, League Island, Pa.	9,986.00	12,425.00	12,425.00
One foreman joiner, at \$4 per diem			
One stenographer and typewriter, civil engineer's office			
One electrician, increase of \$200 per annum from \$1,200			
Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal.	14,820.00	15,291.67	15,291.67
One clerk, civil engineer's office			
Naval station, New Orleans, La.	2,691.00	7,796.50	7,796.50
One stenographer and typewriter, civil engineer's office			
One messenger and janitor, civil engineer's office, at \$2 per diem, including Sundays			
One foreman laborer			
One draftsman			
One messenger, commandant's office, at \$2 per diem, including Sundays			
Navy-yard, New York, N. Y.	21,606.89	23,166.13	23,166.13
One master of tugs			
One time clerk, in lieu of writer at same rate			
Navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.	12,470.89	16,616.87	16,616.87
One foreman mechanic, at \$4.24 per diem			
One foreman of teams, at \$2.24 per diem			
One messenger and janitor, civil engineer's office, at \$2 per diem, including Sundays			
One stenographer and typewriter, civil engineer's office			
One electrician, increase of \$200 per annum from \$1,200			
Navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.	1,932.00	7,511.68	7,511.68
One electrician			
One draftsman, at \$4 per diem			
One foreman laborer, at \$3.52 per diem			
One stenographer, typewriter, and telegraph operator, at \$3.04 per diem			
One writer, at \$2.80 per diem			

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Yards and Docks—Cont'd.			
Civil establishment—Continued.			
Naval station, Port Royal, S. C.	\$6,555.00	\$6,546.50	\$6,546.50
Navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H.	8,350.00	13,737.00	13,737.00
One stenographer and typewriter			
One writer			
One telegraph operator and clerk			
One draftsman			
One master of tugs			
One electrician, increase of \$200 from \$1,200			
Navy-yard, Puget Sound, Wash.	7,614.16	11,468.78	11,468.78
One stenographer and typewriter, civil engineer's office			
One writer			
One messenger, at \$1.75 per diem			
One foreman carpenter, at \$4.50 per diem			
Naval station, Sacket Harbor, N. Y.	966.00	965.00	965.00
Naval station, San Juan, P. R.	2,580.00	3,680.00	3,680.00
One foreman			
Navy-yard, Washington, D. C.	5,701.25	6,595.25	6,595.25
One time clerk			
Total	748,903.70	922,884.57	913,700.92

The increase in this appropriation, as will be seen from the above table, amounts to \$164,887.22 over that appropriated last year.

This is accounted for by an increase in the maintenance of yards and docks recommended by the Bureau. Last year there was a deficiency of \$100,000, and this year the Bureau is asking for a deficiency of \$150,000, in view of the increase in the amount of work done at the different yards and stations.

As will be seen upon an examination of the bill, there are a number of clerks at the different yards and stations employed out of the fund for public works who are now placed upon the permanent roll, and this necessarily makes an increase in the appropriation for the civil establishment.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended by this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Navy-yard, Boston, Mass.	\$290,500.00	\$361,860.00	\$256,800.00
Navy-yard, Charleston, S. C.	300,000.00	951,500.00	
Naval station, Cavite, P. I.	320,000.00	725,000.00	725,000.00
Naval station, Guam	10,000.00		
Naval station, Key West, Fla.	165,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
Navy-yard, League Island, Pa.	309,200.00	605,470.00	512,970.00
Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal.	188,000.00	308,300.00	290,000.00
Naval station, New London, Conn.	2,500.00		
Naval station, New Orleans, La.	111,800.00		271,500.00
Navy-yard, New York, N. Y.	298,000.00	2,073,000.00	371,500.00
Navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.	193,000.00	848,500.00	959,000.00
Navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.	143,000.00	97,000.00	94,000.00
Navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H.	917,000.00	150,000.00	147,000.00
Navy-yard, Puget Sound, Wash.	295,200.00	299,500.00	292,500.00
Naval station, Tutuila, Samoan Islands	39,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00
Navy-yard, Washington, D. C.	224,240.00	657,744.00	575,906.00
Two barracks for enlisted men (to cost \$1,200,000)		400,000.00	
Plans and specifications for public works	30,000.00	35,000.00	
Plans and estimates required by section 3363, Revised Statutes		150,000.00	45,000.00
Repairs and preservation, navy-yards and stations	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
Naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba		1,015,000.00	385,000.00
Naval station, Olongapo, P. I.		862,395.00	862,395.01
Consolidation power plants		600,000.00	300,000.00
Total, public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks	4,336,440.00	10,642,269.00	6,565,571.00

The total estimates for public works amount to \$10,966,769. Your committee, after most careful consideration, reduced these estimates by \$4,421,198, making the total amount recommended \$6,545,571.

The important provisions are these:

First. For the purchase of land, \$400,000, Norfolk Navy-Yard.

By a previous act of Congress condemnation proceedings were authorized for land to extend the Norfolk Navy-Yard. The first award was made at \$672,000. This was regarded by the Department as too high, and another board of commissioners was appointed and they awarded the value at \$475,000. This was also regarded by the Department as too high, but the owners of the property have agreed to take \$400,000 for the same, and this price is satisfactory to the Department and recommended by the Secretary of the Navy. The area of the land is about 272 acres.

Second. The following estimates were submitted for the naval station at Guantanamo, Cuba, by the Department:

Naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba:	
Dry dock	\$300,000
Dredging at Toro Key	40,000
Sea wall at Toro Key	120,000
Reservoir and water system	50,000
Naval hospital	40,000
Clearing and grading	40,000
Coal depot at Hospital Key	370,000
Electric power plant	45,000
Total	1,015,000

In accordance with the Platt amendment and the constitution of the Republic of Cuba, the two Governments agreed upon the lease of two coaling and naval stations in Cuba—one at Bahia Honda, on the north coast of Cuba, about 60 miles west of Habana, and the other on the southern coast of Guantanamo, about 40 miles east of Santiago.

It is proposed to do nothing toward the development of the station on the northern coast, but in regard to Guantanamo there is a great necessity for the development of this naval station. Last year's bill carried an appropriation of \$100,000 for necessary expenditures incident to the occupation and utilization of the naval station at Guantanamo, and this year the deficiency bill, which has just passed the House, carried an appropriation of \$200,000 for the same purpose. This amount has been and will be used toward the purchase of the land, which will be in the neighborhood of \$137,000, and toward the development of the station.

The appropriations recommended amount to \$385,000, and are toward the establishment of a dry dock, \$200,000; dredging, \$40,000; sea wall, \$75,000; water system, \$50,000, and grading, \$20,000.

The harbor is an excellent one, with plenty of water, both in area and depth. It could not be better located to conserve the interests of our country on this hemisphere—first, for the protection of our interests in the West Indies; second, for the defense of the Panama Canal; third, for the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine.

The third important provision under public works is an appropriation of \$862,395 for the naval station at Olongapo, Subig Bay, Philippine Islands. The following are the appropriations recommended in the bill:

Naval station, Olongapo, P. I.:	
To complete survey of reservation	\$20,000
For repairing buildings erected by the Spaniards for temporary use as shops, storehouses, offices, etc.	25,000
Toward building 1,750 feet of quay wall, at \$144 per foot (one-fourth)	63,000
Toward constructing—	
Commandant's quarters	9,000
Three officers' quarters	18,000
Marine barracks and outbuildings	50,000
One marine officer's quarters	6,000
Dredging entrance to basin—channel 400 by 35 feet deep, about 25,000 cubic yards, at 30 cents	7,500
Dredging in basin in front of quay walls, 160,000 cubic yards, at 30 cents, for floating dock	48,000
Water supply from brickyard springs (capacity 50,000 gallons in ten hours), 11,000 feet 4-inch galvanized-iron pipe, 47½ cents per foot	\$5,225
Valves and fittings	250
Freight and transportation	720
Distribution in the yard	1,500
Laying pipes	3,200
Temporary reservoir, 40 by 40 by 10 feet, capacity 100,000 gallons	5,000
One pier for use in landing and receiving stores for immediate use	15,895
Toward coaling plant	100,000
Total	862,395

We have a naval reservation at Olongapo, and the Navy is using it. The reservation is 4 or 5 miles square. A board of naval officers investigated the matter and reported that this is by all means the proper place for the building up of such a naval station as we may need over in the Orient. A general board of army and navy officers are unanimously of the same opinion and have so recommended to Congress in these words:

(1) "That without a fortified naval base in the Philippines the Asiatic fleet can not keep open the lines of communication for supplies from the United States, or between the army posts within the Philippines, without which supplies the military forces of the United States could not hold command of the islands.

(2) "That Manila is not, but that Subig Bay is, suited for a naval base and station, and of all harbors in the archipelago it is the best for the purpose.

(3) "That the fortification of Subig Bay is essential to the security of a naval station located there.

(4) "That a fortified naval base at Subig Bay will contribute materially to the defense of Manila Bay."

When the Philippine Islands came into the possession of the United States we took the old Spanish naval station at Cavite and made some improvements thereon in the way of establishing a coaling plant and buying machinery and tools for the shops. It is the intention of the Department, as soon as practicable, to transfer what we have at Cavite to Subig Bay, so that we will have but one naval station in the East.

In view of our great interests in the East, 7,000 miles away from home, with a large fleet there at all times to protect those interests, it would seem almost criminal negligence on the part of Congress not to provide a naval station where our ships could be docked and repaired. The rapidly developing complications of the whole Eastern situation demands that our Navy should be made as effectual as possible.

The fourth important provision under "Public works" is the clause providing for the consolidation of power, light, and heat plants in the various navy-yards so far as practicable in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy.

The committee on its own motion, and after a personal inspection of some of our navy-yards, have inaugurated this reform, which will in their judgment be a saving of thousands of dollars in the administration of our yards.

NAVAL ACADEMY.

The work of building up the Naval Academy is proceeding in a very satisfactory manner. The seamanship building and the armory are already completed; the marine engineering and naval construction building will be completed within three or four months. The main quarters for the midshipmen will be completed by September next. The other buildings are progressing well.

We have already appropriated \$5,070,000, and \$3,000,000 is recommended for this year, making in all \$8,070,000 of the \$10,000,000, which is the total limit of cost fixed by Congress for the rebuilding of the Academy. It may be said in this connection that there is quite likely to be an unexpended balance of a few hundred thousand dollars.

As a limitation to this appropriation of \$3,000,000 the committee recommend the adoption of the following provision:

"In order to further improve the grounds at the Naval Academy and secure the best site for the naval hospital heretofore authorized and appropriated for, the removal of the cemetery from its present site to another to be selected is authorized and directed, and to this end the sum of \$30,000, or so much as is necessary, to be immediately available, is authorized to be expended out of the \$3,000,000 above appropriated."

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, the estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Public works under Bureau of Navigation:			
Naval Academy (total).....		\$3,000,000.00	\$3,000,000.00
Repairs, Naval Academy.....	\$90,000.00		
Tablets on historic places, Naval Academy.....	500.00		
Total.....	60,500.00	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
Naval training station, California—			
Salt-water fire-protection system.....		14,000.00	
Ventilation and sanitary improvements of barracks.....		5,000.00	
Extension of wharf.....	4,250.00		
	4,250.00	19,000.00	19,000.00
Naval training station, Rhode Island—			
Continuing sea wall and completing breakwater.....		10,000.00	
Moving and rebuilding stables and farmer's house to clear site for officers' quarters.....		4,000.00	
Extending and completing stone quay and coaling pier.....	10,000.00		
Filling two stagnant basins.....	4,500.00		
Additional barracks.....	217,500.00		
	232,000.00	14,000.00	14,000.00
Naval War College, Rhode Island—			
Alterations to commandant's quarters, naval training station, Rhode Island, to fit it for officers' quarters for Naval War College.....		6,500.00	
Furniture for extension of Naval War College.....		1,625.00	
		8,125.00	8,125.00
Naval training station, Great Lakes—			
Purchase of land and establishment of naval training station on shore of Lake Michigan.....		250,000.00	250,000.00

The principal recommendation under this heading is that for the establishment of a training station on the Great Lakes. A board of naval officers was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, in accordance with the act of Congress, to investigate the lakes and recommend a site for the naval training station. Last year they presented a preliminary report to Congress, in which they recommended that the site of the naval training station on the Great Lakes be fixed on the shore of Lake Michigan below latitude 43° 30'.

The reasons for selecting Lake Michigan are made plain in their report, which is known as "Document No. 45, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session," but may be briefly stated as follows:

First. The southern end of Lake Michigan is nearer the center of the population of the Middle West, from which we draw a great part of our enlisted men.

Second. From considerations of strategy a naval base at the southern end of Lake Michigan, 400 miles from foreign territory, was considered preferable to a location on any other of the Great Lakes, which would have been "directly in the face of and almost in sight of the ports of a foreign country."

Third. Because of the fact that "only on Lake Michigan does navigation continue throughout the year," whereas on the other of the Great Lakes navigation is closed anywhere from ninety-three days at Sandusky, Ohio (Lake Erie), which is the average record of twenty-five years, to one hundred and fifty-six days at Marquette, Mich. (Lake Superior), which is the average record of twenty-five years.

Fourth. "It is in the geographical center of the district of the Great Lakes, and is thus better adapted to the purpose than either the eastern subdivision, which is not now in as much need of a station as the subdivisions farther west on account of its nearness to the Atlantic seaboard, or the western or northern subdivisions, which would not only draw their recruits largely from points farther east and south, only to ship them back on their way to the coast, but which do not offer as good a field from which to draw recruits."

The conclusions of this board are unanswerable. Too often in the past naval stations have been located at the behest of local and political influence. The time has come when naval stations should be located for the best interests of the American Navy by men whose business it is to know what the naval service demands.

The board have made a further report this year to Congress, known as Document No. 6, Fifty-eighth Congress, first session, which was transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with the following letter by the Secretary of the Navy:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 11, 1903.

SIR: The act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, contains the following clause:

"Naval training station, Great Lakes: The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to appoint a board composed of naval officers, whose duty it shall be to select on the Great Lakes a suitable site for an additional naval training station, and having selected such site, if upon private lands, to estimate its value and ascertain, as nearly as practicable, the cost for which it can be purchased or acquired, and of their proceedings and actions to make full and detailed report to the Secretary, who shall transmit such report, with his recommendations thereon, to Congress for its action; and to defray the expenses of said board the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be

necessary, to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

On December 13, 1902, I had the honor to inform Congress of the progress at that time made in obedience to the provisions of this act. I then submitted to Congress the preliminary report of the board appointed under the provisions of the act, and stated that when the final report of the board was made it would be submitted to Congress. The preliminary report recommended that the naval training station on the Great Lakes should be fixed on the shores of Lake Michigan below latitude 43° 30'.

I have the honor now to transmit a copy of the final report of the board, in which Lake Bluff, which is 32 miles north of Chicago, is recommended as the most suitable site for a naval training station. In view of the large price at which land at that point is held by the owners, the board suggests four other sites as suitable, which, in the order of their desirability, are as follows: Racine, Muskegon, Milwaukee, and Michigan City.

At the present time a large number of recruits for the naval service are obtained from the States of which Lake Michigan is the center. These men are of high quality in every respect and after one term of enlistment become excellent seamen for service either in the Navy or the merchant marine and in many cases become well fitted for responsible positions in private life.

I respectfully recommend to Congress the earnest consideration of the report of this board and the establishment of a naval training station on the Great Lakes in accordance with its recommendations.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM H. MOODY, Secretary.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

The great problem to-day is the training of men and getting them in shape for the ships as fast as they are completed. Admiral Taylor, in his hearing before the committee, stated that the Department was only asking for 3,000 additional men because they had not at present adequate facilities for training more, and the establishment of this station on the Great Lakes is earnestly recommended.

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Public works, Bureau of Ordnance:			
Naval magazine, New England.....		\$250,000.00	\$70,000.00
Additional improvements at magazine, Iona Island.....	\$14,200.00		
Improvements at magazine, Lake Denmark, N. J.....	19,600.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Improvements at magazine, St. Juliens Creek.....	11,000.00	11,100.00	11,100.00
New buildings and improvements at naval proving grounds.....	10,500.00	121,500.00	121,500.00
Improvements at torpedo station. Water system, etc., at Fort Norfolk.....	25,000.00	34,100.00	34,100.00
Expense of board on site for magazine on New England coast.....	1,500.00		
New magazine, etc., Fort Mifflin, Pa.....	1,000.00		
Observation magazine and filling house, Mare Island, Cal.....		20,000.00	20,000.00
Magazine, shell, and filling house, etc., Philippine Islands.....		2,200.00	2,200.00
		50,000.00	50,000.00
Total.....	82,800.00	498,900.00	318,900.00

The following provision for a naval magazine on the coast of New England is recommended by the committee:

"Naval magazine, New England.—For the purchase of land for a site for a naval magazine on or near the New England coast, north of Cape Cod, and toward the erection thereon of the necessary buildings, of inclosing said grounds, of grading and filling in, of building roads and walks, of the improvement of the water front, of the necessary wharves and cranes, of railroad tracks and rolling stock for local service, of fire and water service, and of the equipment of the establishment, \$70,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary; and the Secretary of the Navy may employ, and pay out of the appropriation hereby authorized, such additional expert aids, surveyors, architects, superintendents of construction, or draftsmen as may be necessary for the preparation of the plans and specifications and prosecution of the work authorized, to an amount not to exceed \$15,000: *Provided*, That the total cost of the establishment, complete in all respects, shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000: *And provided further*, That should the Secretary of the Navy be unable to purchase the land for the site from the owners thereof at a fair and reasonable valuation he is hereby authorized and directed to institute proceedings for the condemnation of such part or parts thereof as may be necessary: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to discontinue the magazine now in the city of Chelsea not later than the time when the new magazine for the New England coast is ready to be occupied, and to sell at public auction or private sale, at a price to be approved by him, all the land now appurtenant to and within the inclosure of the present magazine in said city of Chelsea."

As will be seen, the committee recommends improvements to the naval powder depot at Lake Denmark to the amount of \$10,000.

Also the naval magazine at Norfolk, \$11,100.

Also improvements to the naval torpedo station at Newport, \$34,000.

Also to the naval station at Indian Head, \$121,500.

Also to the naval magazine at Fort Mifflin, \$20,000.

Also naval magazine at Mare Island, \$1,700.

Also naval magazine in the Philippine Islands, \$50,000.

PUBLIC WORKS (BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT)—NAVAL OBSERVATORY.

The small appropriation of \$5,000 is made for the Naval Observatory, and also provision is made for inclosing the grounds by a fence to cost \$2,800.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

The duties of this Bureau are implied in its title and comprise all that relates to laboratories, naval hospitals, and dispensaries. It designs various buildings erected within the navy-yards for its own purposes, so far as their internal arrangements are concerned, and has control of the same after completion. It designs, builds, and maintains all buildings erected for its own purposes outside of navy-yards, and generally estimates for and controls all the details of its own organization.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:			
Medical department.....	\$150,000.00	\$225,000.00	\$225,000.00
Naval hospital fund.....	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
Contingent, medicine and surgery	85,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Transportation of remains.....		15,000.00	15,000.00
Repairs, medicine and surgery...	40,000.00	45,000.00	45,000.00
Total.....	265,000.00	375,000.00	375,000.00
Public work, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:			
Naval hospital, Norfolk, Va.....	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Naval laboratory, New York, N.Y.	75,000.00		
Naval hospital, Washington, D. C.	125,000.00		
Naval hospital, Yokohama, Japan.	25,000.00		
Total.....	245,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00

As will be seen from the above table, there is an increase in the appropriations for this Bureau of \$110,000.

This is made up of an increase of \$75,000 in the first items under the Bureau, for surgeon's necessities for vessels in commission, navy-yards, naval stations, Marine Corps, and for the civil establishment at the several naval hospitals, navy-yards, naval laboratory, museum of hygiene and department of instruction, and Naval Academy.

This year the Medical Bureau asked for a deficiency of \$50,000 for this object.

The appropriation for the naval hospital fund is the same as that of last year.

The appropriation for contingent is increased from \$35,000 to \$50,000. The Bureau asked this year for a deficiency of \$15,000 for this object.

The committee recommends the insertion of the following provision:

"To enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transferred to their homes the remains of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who die in the service or are killed in action ashore or afloat, and also to enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transported to their homes the remains of civilian employees who die outside of the continental limits of the United States, \$15,000."

Appropriation for repairs is also increased by \$5,000.

The committee recommends also the changing of officers' quarters into wards for enlisted men and building quarters for officers at the naval hospital at Norfolk, \$20,000.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

Generally speaking, this is the financial bureau of the Department. Its duties comprise all that relates to requiring for or preparing provisions, clothing, small stores, and contingent stores of the pay department; the purchase of all supplies for the naval establishment, except medical and surgical appliances, and instruments and supplies for the Marine Corps, and the keeping of a proper system of accounts of the same. Like the other bureaus, it estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, the estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:			
Provisions, Navy.....	\$4,000,000.00	\$4,850,000.00	\$4,850,000.00
Clothing and small stores.....	1,000,000.00		
Contingent, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.....	250,000.00	250,000.00	250,000.00
Civil establishment, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.....	103,978.34	103,932.28	103,932.28
Total.....	5,353,978.34	5,203,932.28	5,203,932.28

The appropriation for provisions has been increased this year by \$850,000, due to the fact that we are increasing the number of men.

The appropriation for contingent is the same as last year.

The appropriations for civil establishment are practically the same.

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

The duties of this Bureau comprise all that relate to the designing, building, fitting, and repairing the hulls of ships, their turrets, spars, capstans, windlasses, steering gear, and ventilating apparatus, and, in conjunction with the Bureau of Ordnance, designing the construction of ammunition hoists, their shafts, machinery, and appurtenances; placing and securing armor; placing and securing on board ship the armament and its accessories as manufactured and supplied by the Bureau of Ordnance. It has charge of the care and preservation of ships in reserve, the docking of ships, the designing of ships, and the internal arrangement of the various buildings and shops under its control, and estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Construction and Repair:			
Construction and repair of vessels; Estimate B.....	\$8,000,000.00	\$8,000,000.00	\$8,000,000.00
Improvement of construction plants; Estimate B (special)—			
Construction plant—			
Navy-yard, Portsmouth, N.H.....	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Navy-yard, Boston, Mass.....	50,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Navy-yard, New York, N.Y.....	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Navy-yard, League Island, Pa.....	30,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.....	30,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00
Navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.....		20,000.00	20,000.00
Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal.....	30,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Construction and Repair—Continued.			
Improvement of construction plants, etc.—Continued.			
Construction plant—Cont'd.			
Navy-yard, Puget Sound, Wash.....	\$75,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
Naval station, New Orleans, La.....	25,000.00		
Construction and repair of vessels; Estimate B1 (special)—			
Steel ammunition lighter, naval station, Cavite, P. I.....	30,000.00		
Two seagoing tugs.....		350,000.00	350,000.00
Civil establishment, Estimate C.....	27,024.25	40,824.25	40,824.25
Three clerks, \$1,200 each, at navy-yard, New York.....			
Three clerks, \$1,100 each, at navy-yard, New York.....			
Clerk to naval constructor at navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.....			
One clerk, \$1,000, at navy-yard, Puget Sound, Wash.....			
One clerk, \$600, at navy-yard, Puget Sound, Wash.....			
Clerk to naval constructor at naval station, Cavite, P. I.....			
Two clerks, \$1,200 each, at naval station, Cavite, P. I.....			
Total.....	8,367,024.25	8,595,824.25	8,595,824.25

The appropriations, as will be seen from the above table, are \$228,800 more than those of last year. Some of the appropriations for construction plants at the various yards have been reduced below that appropriated last year, but there has been an increase in the civil establishment of the Bureau by the addition of a number of new clerks, etc., at the different yards, made necessary by the increased work of the Bureau.

Provision is also made for two seagoing tugs to cost \$350,000, one to replace the *Leyden* which was recently wrecked, and the other to furnish additional tug facilities, which are now inadequate.

STEAM ENGINEERING.

The duties of this Bureau comprise all that relates to the designing, building, fitting out, and repairing of the steam machinery, for which steam is the motive power on board ship. Like the other bureaus, it designs the internal arrangement of its various shops at the navy-yard and estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following table gives the comparative statement of the appropriations for 1904, the estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Bureau of Steam Engineering:			
Steam machinery—			
For completion, repairing, and preservation of machinery, boilers, etc.....	\$2,190,000.00	\$2,190,000.00	\$2,190,000.00
For purchase, handling, and preservation of material, stores, etc.....	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00
For incidental expenses for naval vessels, yards, and the Bureau.....	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00
For extended tests of marine steam turbines.....		25,000.00	25,000.00
Improvement of steam engineering plant—			
Boston, Mass., Navy-Yard.....	60,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Norfolk, Va., Navy-Yard.....	25,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Experiment station.....	400,000.00		
Civil establishment.....	17,900.00	17,900.00	17,900.00
Total.....	3,907,900.00	3,572,900.00	3,572,900.00

The appropriations for this Bureau, as will be seen from the above, are considerably lower than that provided for last year.

This is due to the fact that in last year's bill Congress provided for an experiment station \$400,000. Outside of an increase in the steam-engineering plant at Boston of \$15,000, and an increase of \$25,000 in the steam-engineering plant at Norfolk, Va., and an appropriation of \$25,000 for an extended series of tests of marine steam turbines, which are supposed by many to be the coming motor in supplying power for ships, the appropriations recommended are the same as last year.

NAVAL ACADEMY (CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT).

The following table shows the appropriations for 1904, the estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Naval Academy:			
Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy.....	\$77,442.52	\$81,802.52	\$78,920.52
Two attendants in recitation rooms, at \$300 each (new).....			
One assistant instructor in gymnastics (new).....			
One clerk to the superintendent, at \$900 (new).....			
One assistant baker (new).....			

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Naval Academy—Continued.			
Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy—Continued.			
One mechanic in department of physics (new)			
One cook (new)			
Pay of watchmen, mechanics, and others, Naval Academy	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Pay of steam employees, Naval Academy	11,154.82	15,285.94	15,285.94
Two machinists, at \$2.80 per diem each (new)			
Three laborers, at \$1.28 per diem each (new)			
One special laborer, at \$2.80 per diem (new)			
One attendant, at \$300 per annum (new)			
Special course, Naval Academy	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
Repairs, Naval Academy	31,000.00	31,000.00	31,000.00
Heating and lighting, Naval Academy	25,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Contingent, Naval Academy—			
Purchase of books for library	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
Stationery, blank books, models, maps, and text-books for use of instructors	2,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
Expenses of Board of Visitors	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
Purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and instruments in the department of physics and for repair of same	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
Purchase of gas and steam machinery, steam pipes and fittings, rent of building for use of academy, freight, cartage, water, music, musical instruments, astronomical instruments, uniforms of bandmen, telegraphing, feed and maintenance of teams, current expenses and repairs of all kinds, and for incidental labor and expenses not applicable to any other appropriation	50,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
Stores in department of steam engineering	800.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Materials for repairs in steam machinery	1,000.00	1,500.00	1,500.00
For contingencies for the Superintendent of the Naval Academy	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Apparatus for the instruction of midshipmen in the department of marine engineering and naval construction	10,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Repairs of sextants	1,000.00		
Total	270,397.34	314,588.46	311,706.46

There is very little change in the appropriations for the Naval Academy. There is an increase of \$5,000 for compensation of additional force in the department of steam engineering and also an increase of \$5,000 in the appropriation for fuel.

There is an appropriation for an assistant instructor in the gymnasium, \$1,000; one clerk to superintendent, \$300; one assistant baker, \$540; one mechanic in department of physics, \$720; one cook, \$800, and an increase of two attendants at \$300 per annum each.

This is demanded by the increased number of students.

MARINE CORPS.

The Marine Corps is the military branch of the naval service and consists of—

Rank.	Strength January 1, 1904.	Allowed by law.
Brigadier-General, Commandant	1	1
Colonel, adjutant and inspector	1	1
Lieutenant-colonel, assistant adjutant, and inspector	1	1
Majors, assistant adjutant and inspector	3	3
Colonel, quartermaster	1	1
Lieutenant-colonel, assistant quartermaster	1	1
Majors, assistant quartermasters	2	2
Captains, assistant quartermasters	7	8
Colonel, paymaster	1	1
Lieutenant-colonel, assistant paymaster	1	1
Major, assistant paymaster	1	1
Captain, assistant paymaster	1	1
Total	21	22
Colonels	5	6
Lieutenant-colonels	6	6
Majors	15	15
Captains	66	72
First lieutenants	59	85
Second lieutenants	48	72
Total	199	256
Sergeants-major	6	6
Quartermaster-sergeants	60	60

a One since retired and 14 appointed.

Rank.	Strength January 1, 1904.	Allowed by law.
Drum-major	1	1
First sergeants	77	72
Gunnery-sergeants	79	82
Sergeants	361	345
Corporals	620	595
Drummers	76	100
Trumpeters	81	100
Privates	6,037	6,084
Boys learning music	44	25
Leader of band	1	1
Second leader of band	1	1
First-class musicians	29	30
Second-class musicians	30	30
Total	7,523	7,532
Grand total	7,743	7,810

The following table shows the appropriations for 1904, estimates for 1905, and amounts recommended in this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Marine Corps:			
Pay, Marine Corps	\$2,097,778.03	\$2,118,875.53	\$2,120,476.78
Increase of officers on retired list			
Pay of enlisted men; for additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun pointers			
Decrease, pay of officers on the active list			
Total	2,097,778.03	2,118,875.53	2,120,476.78
Provisions, Marine Corps	492,087.50	492,087.50	492,087.50
Clothing, Marine Corps	422,370.00	422,370.00	422,370.00
Fuel, Marine Corps	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Military stores, Marine Corps	110,895.00	110,895.00	110,895.00
To reimburse U. S. Army for 2,000 rifles		28,540.00	28,540.00
Transportation and recruiting, Marine Corps	121,620.00	121,620.00	121,620.00
Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps	66,336.00	66,336.00	66,336.00
Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps, rent	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00
Forage, Marine Corps	17,700.00	17,700.00	17,700.00
Hire of quarters, Marine Corps	30,748.00	35,748.00	35,748.00
Contingent, Marine Corps	136,000.00	160,000.00	160,000.00
Site and depot of supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.	150,000.00		
Norfolk, Va., officers' quarters	42,000.00		
San Francisco, Cal., officers' quarters	16,000.00		
Mare Island, Cal., power house and steam heat	11,000.00		
Portsmouth, N. H., boiler house and bakery		5,000.00	5,000.00
Boston, Mass., electric lights		2,500.00	2,500.00
Washington, D. C., addition to barracks, etc.		150,000.00	150,000.00
New Orleans, La., addition to appropriation for barracks and quarters		6,500.00	6,500.00
Olongapo, P. I., cold-storage and ice plant		5,000.00	5,000.00
Total	1,672,756.50	1,630,296.50	1,630,296.50

From the above it will be seen that the total appropriations are about the same as last year.

The most important provision is that of \$150,000 for an addition to the marine barracks at Washington, including the erection and furnishing of a band room, mess hall, men's kitchen, and men's gymnasium. The old building was constructed about 1812 and has already been condemned by two boards of medical officers.

Appropriation of \$5,000 is recommended for improvements at the marine barracks and quarters at navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H.; \$2,500 at navy-yard, Boston, Mass.; \$8,500 at naval station, New Orleans, and \$5,000 at naval station, Olongapo, P. I.

The committee desires to call attention to a provision inserted in the bill providing for additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun pointers. This is strongly recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, and under this provision it is proposed to give the enlisted men in the Marine Corps who excel in gunnery the same additions to their pay as are given enlisted men in the Navy.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

The following table shows the amounts appropriated for 1904, the estimates for 1905, and the amounts recommended by this bill:

	Appropriated, 1904.	Estimates, 1905.	Carried by bill.
Increase of the Navy:			
Construction and machinery	\$15,025,632.00	\$23,826,860.00	\$19,826,860.00
Armor and armament	10,000,000.00	12,000,000.00	12,000,000.00
Equipment	400,000.00	400,000.00	
Submarines	500,000.00		
Total	25,925,632.00	36,226,860.00	31,826,860.00

The following table shows the degree of completion of our ships now under construction:

FEBRUARY 9, 1904.

Vessels under construction, United States Navy.

No.	Name.	Speed.	Where building.	Degree of completion.	
				Jan. 1, 1904.	Feb. 1, 1904.
<i>Battle ships.</i>					
		<i>Knots.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
11	Missouri	18	Newport News Co	99.9	99.95
12	Ohio	18	Union Iron Works	84.5	85.5
13	Virginia	19	Newport News Co	52.5	53.8
14	Nebraska	19	Moran Bros. Co	35	37.
15	Georgia	19	Bath Iron Works	42.5	45.4
16	New Jersey	19	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	49.43	50.3
17	Rhode Island	19	do	50.61	51.7
18	Connecticut	18	Navy-yard, New York, N. Y.	26.7	28.5
19	Louisiana	18	Newport News Co	34.5	37.55
20	Vermont	18	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	2.76	3.6
21	Kansas	18	New York Shipbuilding Co.	2.6	3.9
22	Minnesota	18	Newport News Co	12	14.73
<i>Armored cruisers.</i>					
4	Pennsylvania	22	William Cramp & Sons	64.9	66.8
5	West Virginia	22	Newport News Co	70.5	73.32
6	California	22	Union Iron Works	51	54
7	Colorado	22	William Cramp & Sons	69	71.8
8	Maryland	22	Newport News Co	65.4	69.15
9	South Dakota	22	Union Iron Works	47	50
10	Tennessee	22	William Cramp & Sons	15.1	16.6
11	Washington	22	New York Shipbuilding Co.	12	13.9
<i>Protected cruisers.</i>					
14	Denver	17	Neafie & Levy	98	98
15	Des Moines	16½	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	97	99
16	Chattanooga	16½	Lewis Nixon	72	72
17	Galveston	16½	William R. Trigg Co.	70.5	72
18	Tacoma	16½	Union Iron Works	99	100
19	St. Louis	22	Neafie & Levy	36.2	37.9
21	Milwaukee	22	Union Iron Works	41	42.5
22	Charleston	22	Newport News Co	56.9	60
<i>Gunboats.</i>					
17	Dubuque	12	Gas Engine and Power Co.	20	25
18	Paducah	12	do	16	22.2
<i>Training ships.</i>					
	Cumberland	Sails.	Navy-yard, Boston	12	25.5
	Intrepid	Sails.	Navy-yard, Mare Island ..	5	7
<i>Training brig.</i>					
	Boxer	Sails.	Navy-yard, Portsmouth ..	6	10
<i>Torpedo boats.</i>					
19	Stringham	30	Harlan & Hollingsworth ..	93	93
20	Goldsborough	30	Wolf & Zwicker	99	99
27	Blakely	26	George Lawley & Son	99	99
29	Nicholson	26	Lewis Nixon	99	99
30	O'Brien	26	do	98	98
34	Tingey	26	Columbian Iron Works ..	100	-----
<i>Steel tugs.</i>					
8	Pentucket	12	Navy-yard, Boston	100	-----
9	Sotoyomo	12	Navy-yard, Mare Island ..	98	99

To complete all the ships authorized up to the present time, including their construction and machinery, armor and armament, and equipment, will cost \$82,718,659, which may be divided as follows:

Construction and machinery \$46,532,450
 Armor and armament 35,786,209
 Equipment 400,000

Of this sum we appropriate in this bill \$19,826,860 for construction and machinery and \$12,000,000 for armor and armament, making a total of \$31,826,860, which leaves a balance of \$50,891,699 to be appropriated hereafter.

NAVAL PROGRAMME.

For the purpose of further increasing the naval establishment of the United States, the President is hereby authorized to have constructed by contract or in navy-yards as hereinafter provided—

One first-class battle ship, carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful armament for a vessel of its class upon a trial displacement of not more than 16,000 tons; to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$4,400,000.

Two first-class armored cruisers, of not more than 14,500 tons trial displacement, carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful armament for a vessel of its class; to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$4,400,000 each.

Three scout cruisers, of not more than 3,750 tons trial displacement, carrying the most powerful ordnance of vessels of their class; to have the highest speed compatible with good cruising qualities and great radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armament, not exceeding \$1,800,000 each.

To colliers, to be capable of accompanying the battle fleet; to carry 5,000 tons of cargo coal, loaded, and to have a trial speed of not less than 16 knots, to cost not exceeding \$1,250,000 each.

The complete cost of constructing the ships above recommended will be as follows:

One first-class battle ship, carrying the heaviest armor and most power-

ful armament for a vessel of its class, upon a trial displacement of not more than 16,000 tons, to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action. Cost:

Hull and machinery (includes miscellaneous outfit and equipment). \$4,400,000
 Armor 1,800,000
 Armament (includes ammunition and miscellaneous ordnance equipment) 1,525,000
 Equipment outfit not included in the contract with the shipbuilder. 50,000

Total 7,775,000

Two first-class armored cruisers, of not more than 14,500 tons trial displacement, carrying the heaviest armor and most powerful armament for vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and great radius of action. Cost (each):

Hull and machinery (includes miscellaneous outfit and equipment) \$4,400,000
 Armor 1,175,000
 Armament (includes ammunition and miscellaneous ordnance equipment) 850,000
 Equipment outfit not included in the contract with the shipbuilder. 50,000

Total 6,505,000

Three scout cruisers, of not more than 3,750 tons trial displacement, carrying the most powerful ordnance of vessels of their class, to have the highest practicable speed compatible with good cruising qualities and great radius of action. Cost (each):

Hull and machinery (includes miscellaneous outfit and equipment). \$1,800,000
 Armament (includes ammunition and miscellaneous ordnance equipment) 375,000
 Equipment outfit not included in the contract with the shipbuilder. 25,000

Total 2,200,000

Two colliers, to be capable of accompanying the battle fleet, to carry 5,000 tons of cargo coal loaded, and to have a trial speed of not less than 16 knots. Total cost (each), \$1,250,000.

The total cost of the above programme will be \$29,885,000.

It is left within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy to build any or all of these ships in Government navy-yards, and he is required to build some of them in the navy-yards in case it shall appear that the shipbuilding concerns have entered into any combination or understanding to deprive the Government of fair and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of these vessels.

And the Secretary of the Navy, in case he can not secure armor of the best quality for any or all of these ships at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable, is authorized and directed to procure a site and erect thereon an armor-plate factory, toward which the sum of \$4,000,000 is appropriated in this bill.

The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to contract for or purchase two subsurface or submarine torpedo boats, after they have been fully tested to his satisfaction and found to fulfill all reasonable requirements for submarine warfare. The appropriation made last year for this purpose of \$500,000, or such part thereof as may remain unexpended, is reappropriated in this bill.

This is a moderate and reasonable programme and one that we believe will be approved throughout the country.

The committee recommend the construction of more than the usual number of cruisers in view of the fact that last year we provided for five large battle ships. This will give a better proportion to our Navy.

If we judge public sentiment aright it is in favor of the continuance of the policy of building up our Navy. If we stopped now we would be left behind the leading countries of the world.

The American people will not indorse the policy of sacrificing the American Navy for internal improvements, nor is there any such necessity.

Foremost and above all must stand considerations of national defense, maintenance of our foreign policies, and protection of American citizens everywhere. The American people are not willing to lessen their influence on this hemisphere, nor forsake their interests on the other.

FOREIGN NAVAL PROGRAMMES.

Great Britain.—From year to year the policy of keeping the British navy superior to the navies of any two possible enemies is adhered to. The building programme for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1904, is well under way; many of the vessels are begun, and it is probable all will be before the fiscal year has elapsed. In addition to the vessels included in the programme, two battle ships completing in England for Chile have been purchased.

The building programme was as follows: Three battle ships (since announced to be of 16,350 tons each); 4 armored cruisers (since announced to be of 13,550 tons each); 3 protected cruisers, third class (probably 3,000 tons each); 4 scouts (of 2,900 tons each); 15 torpedo-boat destroyers (of about 500 tons each); 10 submarines.

As a part of the programme England is steadily engaged in reconstructing and rearming her armored war ships, some even of later date than 1890, in order to keep them up to the most modern standard of efficiency.

France.—From the report on the French naval budget for 1904:

"It is impossible to keep up the budgetary struggle with her (England). Considering all other nations, France spends more on her navy per capita than any of the others. * * * France has reached the limit of her expenditures, but there can be no reduction for the present. In fact, the expenditures, for various reasons, must continue to increase."

The French naval budget for 1904 was passed during the last days of December, 1903, substantially as reported:

"The prevailing idea is one of economy, and the total credits are about the same as those of last year. On the other hand, the budgets of foreign nations show a steady increase."

The new construction authorized is 1 armored cruiser of 13,644 tons, 2 destroyers of 335 tons each, 51 torpedo boats, 16 submarines.

The building going on under previous programmes includes, among other vessels, 6 battle ships.

Germany.—New construction continues under the famous ship-building programme of 1900, the estimates submitted in December, 1903, for the year 1904 providing for the following: Two battle ships of 13,000 tons each, 1 armored cruiser of 9,500 tons, 3 cruisers of 3,000 tons, 1 gunboat, 6 high-sea torpedo boats (300 tons each).

According to the same programme, in addition to the new construction, old ships will be replaced gradually by new ones, the total amount of such replacement aggregating, in 1917, 17 battle ships, 7 armored cruisers, 27 small cruisers.

German and French newspapers also anticipate a proposition to broaden the programme of 1900 by laying down 5 additional battle ships for foreign service.

The budget for 1904 provides for 40,000 officers and men, which is more than double the number of ten years ago.

Russia.—The new construction authorized by the naval programme of 1903 comprises 2 battle ships of 16,500 tons each, 2 battle ships of 12,500 tons each,

2 armored cruisers of 6,750 tons each, and a large number of torpedo boats (number not stated).

The battle ships and cruisers have been begun.

Italy.—The new vessels authorized under the budget of 1903-4 are 3 battle ships of 12,625 tons each; 8 first-class torpedo boats, 2 submarines.

Two of these battle ships have been begun; it is uncertain whether or not the third has been.

Japan.—A naval programme was laid down by the Japanese Parliament in July, 1903, for completion in 1913. The vessels to be begun this year under the programme are, 1 battle ship of 16,000 tons, 1 river gunboat of 150 tons, 1 repair ship of 4,000 tons.

It is reported that the contract for the battle ship has been placed in England.

Japan has secured by purchase the 2 armored cruisers just completed in Italy for Argentina.

Austria.—A programme for ten years (1898-1908) is being carried out, and under it 2 battle ships, 1 armored cruiser, and a number of smaller vessels are in course of construction. It is reported that a third battle ship was to be laid down in 1903, but it is probable this has not been done.

NAVAL RESERVES OF THE PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS.

In the navies where service is compulsory, as is the case with all the eight considered, except England and the United States, there are large numbers of trained men who have served their enlistments at sea and are held ready as reserves. This gives such navies an enrolled and effective force, which in some cases is larger than its force in regular service; thus, Germany is said to be able to reman her fleet two or three times. The figures given below are such as are obtainable at short notice.

England is said to have a total effective reserve of 72,000 men. Of these, the most valuable are the Royal Naval Reserves, consisting of 1,500 lieutenants, ensigns, and midshipmen, 400 engineers, and 20,000 blue jackets. Of these, 100 line officers and 100 engineers are training with the regular service, the line officers serving regularly on the larger ships for periods of one year.

France has 468 reserve officers. If her reserves were used to fill up the complements of all her ships, there would still be left 19,000 blue jackets as a reserve.

Germany has 378 reserve officers and 75,000 reserve blue jackets.

No figures for Russia are obtainable.

The blue jackets in Italy's first and second reserves number 33,128.

Japan has 1,480 line and engineer officers in her reserves, and in 1902 she had 5,965 reserve blue jackets.

Austria has 68 reserve officers of the line and engineers. One authority estimates her reserve of blue jackets at 20,000. A blue jacket, after an enlist-

ment of four years, goes into the first reserve for five years and then into the second reserve for another three years.

Number of officers and men of the principal naval powers.

Country.	Commissioned line and engineer officers.	Total commissioned officers, seagoing corps. ^a	Midshipmen and cadets. ^b	Warrant officers. ^c	Blue jackets. ^d	Marine officers. ^e	Marines. ^{de}
England	3,546	4,595	1,254	1,892	100,143	474	19,106
France	2,065	2,830	461	1,078	46,603	—	—
Russia	1,935	2,300	430	790	49,663	—	—
Germany	1,384	1,736	688	774	31,914	87	1,229
United States	941	1,337	753	525	27,245	220	6,091
Italy	1,057	1,637	165	735	25,000	—	—
Japan	919	1,378	1,240	771	27,339	—	—
Austria	583	806	180	155	9,124	—	—

^a These officers include the corps of surgeons, paymasters, and chaplains. Russia has no pay corps, the duties being performed by line officers. Russia, Japan, and Italy have no chaplains.

^b The number for England includes, besides 642 midshipmen at sea, 612 cadets (line and engineer), allowed for in the estimates of 1903-4.

^c There are no exact equivalents for the warrant officers of England and the United States in other services; the numbers given for each service are those of chief petty officers, whose position and duties place them as intermediate between commissioned officers and other enlisted men.

^d The blue jackets and marines for the United States are those in service on June 30, 1903; there are at present authorized by law 81,000 blue jackets and 7,532 marines.

^e England and the United States are the only nations among those considered which maintain a separate establishment of soldiers (officers and men) under a navy department. In 1800 the French force of marine infantry and marine artillery was transferred to the war department for colonial service. Germany's marines are recruited from men shipped as landsmen under the navy department, but they are uniformed as soldiers and are commanded by officers turned over from the army. Russia has a somewhat similar arrangement, army officers being detailed for duty at sea and to command detachments of sailors ashore.

SEA STRENGTH OF THE PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS.

Number and displacement of war ships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons displacement.

Type.	Great Britain.				France.				Russia.				Germany.			
	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	50	669,000	9	142,800	20	223,621	6	87,800	17	201,129	8	112,864	14	152,581	6	77,932
Other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads	6	49,900	—	—	20	94,615	—	—	12	66,679	—	—	16	90,773	—	—
Armored cruisers	27	282,800	14	166,000	15	113,767	8	91,849	8	71,261	—	—	3	28,144	3	28,048
Protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000 tons)	21	201,950	—	—	4	31,513	—	—	6	39,546	3	19,965	—	—	—	—
Protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons)	53	235,880	7	21,600	19	79,752	—	—	5	19,450	3	9,445	9	46,949	—	—
Other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons)	44	96,510	8	21,610	18	32,840	—	—	11	18,093	—	—	31	69,427	4	11,715
Total	201	1,516,040	38	351,210	96	576,108	14	179,649	59	416,158	14	142,274	73	387,874	13	117,745
Combined total	239, of 1,867,250 tons.				110, of 755,757 tons.				73, of 558,432 tons.				86, of 505,619 tons.			

Type.	United States.				Italy.				Japan.				Austria.			
	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Building.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	11	125,129	5	166,700	14	173,276	5	63,125	6	84,300	—	—	—	—	3	31,800
Other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads	12	47,945	—	—	3	12,244	—	—	3	13,004	—	—	11	62,480	2	16,720
Armored cruisers	2	17,415	8	111,800	5	31,891	1	7,264	8	73,550	—	—	2	11,520	1	7,400
Protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000 tons)	2	14,750	3	28,800	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons)	15	53,393	4	12,400	5	17,490	—	—	10	41,226	3	10,095	2	8,128	—	—
Other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons)	23	32,773	2	2,170	11	23,937	—	—	17	31,506	—	—	6	11,785	—	—
Total	65	294,405	23	321,870	38	253,838	6	70,419	44	243,586	3	10,095	21	93,913	6	55,920
Combined total	96, of 616,275 tons.				44, of 329,257 tons.				47, of 253,681 tons.				27, of 149,833 tons.			

^a Battle ships, first class, are of (about) 10,000 tons or more displacement, and are not more than 20 years old. (The few exceptions as to age have been reconstructed and are given a modern armament.)

^b Contract not yet awarded for two additional authorized.

N. B.—Gunboats and other vessels of less than 1,000 tons are not given in the table, nor are transports, dispatch vessels, converted merchant vessels or yachts, or obsolete cruisers. Vessels not begun are not included in the table.

Number of torpedo vessels and submarines, built and building.

Type.	Great Britain.		France.		Russia.		Germany.		United States.		Italy.		Japan.		Austria.	
	Built.	Building.	Built.	Building.	Built.	Building.	Built.	Building.	Built.	Building.	Built.	Building.	Built.	Building.	Built.	Building.
Torpedo-boat destroyers	125	21	25	13	49	9	32	12	16	—	11	2	19	—	7	—
Torpedo boats	90	—	290	30	165	5	93	—	30	4	142	8	67	18	61	—
Submarines	9	10	30	10	1	—	—	3	8	—	1	2	—	—	1	—
Total	224	31	315	53	215	14	125	15	54	4	154	12	86	18	69	—
Combined total	255		368		229		140		58		166		104		69	

Relative order of war-ship strength.

At present.		As would be the case were vessels building now completed.	
Nation.	Tonnage.	Nation.	Tonnage.
Great Britain.....	1,516,040	Great Britain.....	1,867,250
France.....	576,108	France.....	755,757
Russia.....	416,158	United States.....	616,275
Germany.....	387,874	Russia.....	558,432
United States.....	294,405	Germany.....	505,619
Italy.....	258,838	Italy.....	329,257
Japan.....	243,586	Japan.....	253,681
Austria.....	93,913	Austria.....	149,833

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, what we have to-day before us is a brief business bill of appropriations for the naval service for the coming fiscal year, carrying the sum of \$96,338,034.94. The scope of the bill and its objects have been fully and clearly stated in the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs through its chairman [Mr. Foss] and in his opening address.

With that recommendation and the able arguments by which it was supported I agree.

Mr. Chairman, in the remarks that I shall submit upon this bill I do not propose to make a merely technical speech or one of detail, or even to discuss generally the history and value of our Navy to us in the past, or of an adequate navy to any state aspiring to a place among the nations. As a member of the Naval Committee I have more than once presented this branch of the subject. There is hardly any occasion for it now. Public opinion, which was once much divided, is now practically unanimous for a navy which shall be effective for our wants and needs as a leading power of the globe, with large and extensive interests to defend. The increase and maintenance of the Navy is not a sectional question. The West is as much interested as the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that some sentiment is sought to be created against the steady growth of the Navy, it being urged that we already have too many ships, too many men, too many guns; that the Navy is top-heavy, and that the money needed to enlarge it or to maintain it should be devoted to the improvement of our rivers and harbors, public buildings, etc. Sir, as a representative of one of the States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, interested in the improvement of its waterways and seashore, I would not sacrifice the great commercial interests of that section for mere pride of power or the glory of possessing a great navy. I regard such work of improvement as second to none in its benefits to the people, to the farmers and producing classes, and to our commercial interests.

Commerce is the great adjunct of civilization, industry, and progress, and our lakes, rivers, and harbors, provided by nature for its facilities, are arteries that may not be neglected in scientific improvements to meet the expanding needs of navigation; but all these and other requisites can be provided without encroaching upon the means for national defense.

The great Mississippi Valley can not permit the mouth of the Mississippi River, its natural outlet for commerce, to be blocked by a hostile fleet any more than by those natural obstructions to commerce which science is now removing.

The denizens of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are keenly alive to the protection of their cities and the development of trade to Australia, South America, the Orient, and, in truth, to all the world. Nor is the question in any sense a party question. Since 1883 both the political parties have been friendly to this policy, and all the Secretaries of each party have urged a liberal expenditure. I have a right to point to the energetic efforts, zeal, and intelligence of Secretary Whitney and Secretary Herbert in this grand work.

The Democratic party has been in all its history jealous of a large standing army, knowing that in other lands it had been often used by bad rulers to deprive the people of their rights and to commit them to bloody, expensive, and ruinous wars; but it has had no such dread of the Navy. With our party the Navy has always been the favorite arm of national defense, and it will continue to be so. Fortunately, in this country we do not need a large standing army. We have a large arms-bearing population, easily converted into good soldiers, and we have a large volunteer soldiery. We have more than one excellent military school besides West Point for the training of our officers. We have no powerful or dangerous neighbor to guard against. We have peaceful relations with Great Britain, and I hope and believe they will continue to be friendly; but if it were unfortunately otherwise no invasion from Canada is even a possible peril.

I can not forget, sir, that we have a population of near 80,000,000. It is rapidly increasing. Our lands are fertile and we have every variety of production. There is probably no large area of terri-

tory in the world capable of sustaining so large a population as ours with general comfort and happiness. With this vast area of soil, and every year developing some new method of human sustenance and advancement, no man can fix a limit upon our growth. In agriculture we are easily the first of the nations. Our manufactures are already being shipped to every part of the world; but this grand movement which has so seriously alarmed the industrial centers of Europe has barely begun. Our commercial marine, I admit, is not what it should be nor what it will be at no distant day. Other nations have grown in wealth and population, but we have outgrown them all in wealth. In population we are second, indeed, to Russia, but we are immeasurably superior to that country in wealth and resources. China has a vast population, but the great mass are paupers. She is notoriously deficient in the arts of war and peace, has no capital, and can not now be regarded as a rival to any country. Neither her army nor her navy deserve any consideration.

With a rapidly growing nation and a developing commerce with all the world, we

NEED THE "OPEN DOOR" FOR OUR TRADE.

as far as it is possible to have it, and we need also the ability to protect our commerce and our markets. How can we do this, or even attempt to do it, without a strong and efficient navy?

This is not all. Let us remember, sir, that we have a line of seacoast on the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific to defend which can not be less than six or eight thousand miles; it is far greater than that of any European nation. In addition to this we have Alaska to defend, both by sea and by land. Alaska does not represent the new-fledged policy of greed and foreign conquest. We bought her from Russia many years ago, and she proves to have great resources. Then there is Hawaii, which we secured by agencies which some regard as more questionable, but it is an important outpost on the Pacific, and that people have certainly been greatly blessed by our rule. I did not favor its annexation, but I do favor its defense, if necessary.

CUBAN POLICY.

I come now to a yet more vital point. I mean Cuba and the West Indies. I think it would be very unwise to annex Cuba, either as a State or a Territory, even if she came to us voluntarily. We have had trouble enough already with incongruous elements of population. Let Cuba carve out her own destinies in peace. She has a wonderfully fertile soil, and the proof is that in two years she recovered from the ravages of a long and desolating war and all her people are now employed. No laborer stands in need of work. But we have dislodged Spanish power. We have made Cuba free and independent, and we can not and will not permit any European government to establish dominion there. In order to make good our position there and properly guard our interests in respect to Cuba, we must maintain and develop our naval strength. The same is true in respect to Porto Rico.

I think the truth of these observations can not be denied by any intelligent man; but there is another and a fixed policy of the United States handed down to us by our ancestors to which we have to look. I refer to the well-known Monroe doctrine. I do not need to recite its history to this House. The country is familiar with it since the time it was formally announced by President Monroe in the early days of the last century. It was in substance, as embodied in his message of 1823, that while we did not propose to disturb the possessions then held by the powers of Europe in North and South America, we would regard as an unfriendly and hostile act the attempt by any one or more of them to extend their dominions in this part of the globe. The republics of South America were especially in the views of this announcement, for it was these countries that were supposed to be menaced by the Holy Alliance. But Cuba, the West Indies, and Mexico were objects of even greater concern to us—Cuba especially.

There has never been a day that our people would have permitted Cuba to be held by any other power of Europe than Spain. Since that memorable declaration of President Monroe we have witnessed the unscrupulous partition of the vast continent of Africa by the powers of Europe and the occupation of large parts of Asia by this or that European power.

NO PARTITION OF CHINA.

When it came to the proposed partition of China not long ago, we threw our influence against it, but I fear the scheme was arrested far more by the jealousies of the great powers than by our interposition. It is suspended for the present, and, I fear, for the present only. It is still a menace to China and our own interests.

I have said enough to show that, without adopting a policy of imperialism, colonies, and conquests, a strong navy for us is indispensable to guard our varied interests and maintain our just rights all over the world. We have interests everywhere to defend and protect. [Applause.]

In this cursory and imperfect review I have said nothing of the proposed isthmian canal. At an early day the construction of such a canal by the American Government will be commenced, to be paid for out of our own Treasury, to be under American sovereignty, and to be operated, managed, and guarded by us. Other nations are to share in its benefits, but it is to be an American canal, just as the Suez Canal is substantially and effectively a British canal.

But how can we guard and

PROTECT OUR CANAL.

if it is to be at the mercy of any one of three or four European powers which may happen to have a superior navy? We have, indeed, a treaty with Great Britain, which gives a reasonable assurance in that quarter, but we have none bearing on this question with Germany, France, Russia, or Italy, to say nothing of Japan, Austria, and the South American powers. Yet it is proposed to expend \$200,000,000 and more on this canal, which could be destroyed in forty-eight hours by any country having a superior fleet to our own. I favor the canal, but I favor also a navy capable of defending it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is unwise to regard the Navy in itself as an incentive to foreign wars or to an aggressive policy. On the contrary, I regard a strong navy, built and armed on modern lines, as a measure of peace.

I do not wish to see the commerce of this country or the shores of this country lying at the mercy of any one of half a dozen nations which may be superior to us in naval power. I think that with an adequate naval force proportioned to our wealth, commerce, foreign trade, and domestic resources we are far more apt to preserve peace with foreign nations than if by neglect or shortsightedness we suffer ourselves to fall behind in naval power.

I applaud the excellent system of land fortifications upon which we entered a few years ago, but these forts are most valuable to us as an adjunct and base to our fleets and navy-yards. The ship at sea, or able to go there, is your true fortification.

If we have a strong, efficient navy our forts will probably not have occasion to fire a gun. The fleets of a foreign foe will not darken our shores. Our commerce, both here and in remote quarters of the globe, will be protected. More than this, foreign nations, however unfriendly or jealous or hostile, will hesitate to assail us. They will not be provoked to war by the idea that it will be an easy job to inflict on us a great humiliation and injury. They will be careful to avoid offensive demands or an aggressive policy.

EXPANSION OF COMMERCE.

We all know that a great expansion of our foreign commerce is going on all the time. We are exporting not only cotton, cereals, wheat, corn, flour, tobacco, naval stores, petroleum, coal, pig iron, copper, and all the products of our soil and mines, but also our manufactures of iron and steel, and many other articles. We are beginning to compete with our manufactures in the markets of the world, and we are selling our manufactured goods in the very countries that for a century and more have been supplying us with those very articles we now export. With a commerce so rapidly expanding, and already so vast, the necessity of a strong navy can not be denied.

SEA POWER IMPORTANT.

One of the ablest of modern writers on naval topics and history, Captain Mahan, has shown us the vast importance of sea power to a people. Sea power gave preeminence to Athens, Carthage, and Rome. Sea power more than any one cause enabled England to carry on her long struggle with Napoleon and eventually to triumph over the man of destiny. Sea power made our war with Mexico vastly easier by the safe transportation of men, material, food, and every element of military supply.

Sea power, as I have asserted, turned the scale in the civil war. Sea power placed China at the mercy of Japan a few years ago. Sea power—naval superiority—the victory of our naval forces at Santiago practically ended the late Spanish war. The Spanish navy was wiped out. Spain realized that she could not reinforce her army of occupation in Cuba by a man or a gun, and she knew that with the command of the sea the United States could send any number of men to Cuba that might become neces-

sary in order to surround and capture the Spanish forces. It was no longer an equal combat. This proud and gallant nation was forced to yield. And so it has been always. Sea power is the glory and security of a people. The nation that possesses it starts in a fight with a great and manifest advantage.

I should much regret if anyone were to infer from what I have said that I favor a policy of war and conquest. I desire peace with all my heart. I appreciate profoundly the miseries of war under any circumstances. War is a calamity, however just and necessary. The late Spanish war carried evils in its train which many are beginning to believe will far outweigh any possible benefits. Of these I do not now care to speak, but there is one mischievous result to which I may advert as directly appropriate to the pending question. We engaged a power which did not have a third of our population or a tenth part of our wealth and resources, with an army brave enough, but badly fed, badly equipped, badly officered, and who were fighting over 3,000 miles away from their own soil. That army was bound to be overcome in the end, unless Spain could maintain her command of the sea and supply it from time to time with reinforcements of men, food, arms, munitions, and all that is necessary to equip and keep up an army in war. Hence, in order to keep her hold on Cuba, Spain was compelled to send her fleet to the West Indies and put up the best fight she could. We did not have a large navy, but it was almost perfect in its way.

It was immensely superior to that of Spain. Spain has not been a strong naval power for centuries. In the early days her galleons were the easy prey of the English buccaneers and daring adventurers. The "invincible Spanish armada," prepared with so much ostentation and expense to overwhelm England in the days of Queen Elizabeth, was easily baffled, defeated, and destroyed by one-third or one-half their number of British vessels manned by men of our own stock and race. From that day to this Spain has not figured as a naval power. I do not mean to reflect upon Spanish valor or character, but as a nation she has not exhibited naval aptitude like that of the northern nations of Europe. So when the Spanish war came on, Spain had a navy, it is true, but a navy on paper; brave and splendid heroes like Cervera and his associate captains, but it was no match for our few efficient and well-handled ships.

The battles of Manila Bay and Santiago were very easy victories. If you doubt this statement, look at the lists of the killed and wounded on each side, a few only on our side and thousands on the other. Compare these suggestive figures with the naval battles of the war of 1812, such as the *Constitution* and *Guerriere*, the *Chesapeake* and the *Shannon*, and all the others of our history, including that battle which is painted on our walls, when Perry had to quit his sinking ship to fight in another, or when John Paul Jones, by sheer endeavor and with his decks running with blood, upheld the glory of our arms till the enemy struck his flag. It is needless to refer to the bloody battles of the Nile, the Baltic, or Trafalgar, in the days when a ship would lose half her crew and still fight on till victory crowned endurance and valor and suffering.

SPAIN A WEAK MARITIME POWER.

Over this easy victory against Spain folly has gone wild, and many interpret it as a proof that we are already a great naval power and that the world is half afraid of us. For one I do not believe it. This battle was not fought with a great maritime power, but with a very weak one, and we have no right to assume that a British, French, or a German ship is like a Spanish ship, and not equal to our own. The ships of Great Britain, Germany, and France have all the aids of modern naval science; they have officers of trained skill, high courage, with good crews, and if ever we should have to meet one of them it will be a very different combat from that at Santiago or Manila. Our officers and men will do all that we have a right to ask, but it will be no holiday task.

CONSIDER OUR NAVAL STRENGTH.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to consider, first, what is our naval strength to-day, and also that of the leading European powers. I say to-day, secondly, it is well to ask what are they doing in the way of an increase, and what are we doing?

It would be trifling with a great question and with this House to speak on this point with a lack of candor. I shall not do so. The building of a navy or even of a single vessel of war is not a thing that can be hidden from the world. The effective strength of the navies of the great powers is a matter of publicity and notoriety. We know the present strength of England, Russia, France, and Germany. All these powers, save Russia, have to go before the legislative bodies to procure the means and authority to increase their armaments, just as our own Executive comes to Congress for the necessary supplies and authority. I venture the assertion that there is not a government in Europe that does not know exactly our strength and our weakness, how many fighting

battle ships we have, how many we are building, and how long we will have to wait for their completion. Let us, therefore, look the truth fairly in the face.

APPENDIX.

[Data carefully compiled by Mr. F. B. Whitney, clerk of the Committee on Naval Affairs, from official sources.]

SHIPS AND MEN OF ALL NATIONS.

In presenting sea strength, gunboats and vessels of less than 1,000 tons are not considered, as well as transports, converted yachts, dispatch vessels, or obsolete cruisers and battle ships over twenty years old, unless modernized with new armament.

The relative order of war strength on the 1st day of February, 1904, was:

Country.	Tonnage.	Men and officers.
Great Britain.....	1,516,040	131,010
France.....	576,108	53,037
Russia.....	416,158	55,208
Germany.....	387,874	37,632
United States.....	294,405	37,112
Italy.....	258,838	28,494
Japan.....	243,586	31,697
Austria.....	93,913	10,845

GREAT BRITAIN'S SHIPS.

Great Britain has 50 first-class battle ships (10,000 tons or more each), with a tonnage of 69,000, built, and is building 9, with tonnage of 142,600. Other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads number 6, built, with tonnage of 49,900.

Her armored cruisers built are 27, with tonnage of 262,800, while in the course of construction are 14, with tonnage of 166,000. Protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000 tons), number 21 built, tonnage 201,950. She is not building any protected cruisers. Protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons), constitute the largest class built—53, with tonnage of 255,880, and building 7, with tonnage of 21,000. Great Britain's other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons) number 44 built, with tonnage of 96,510, while on the stocks she has 8, with tonnage of 21,610.

Great Britain's total ships built are 201, with tonnage of 1,516,040; building 38, with tonnage of 351,210. Her total strength, built and building, is 239 ships, with 1,867,250 tons.

Great Britain's small vessels are: Built—torpedo-boat destroyers, 125; torpedo boats, 90; submarines, 9; total, 224; building—torpedo-boat destroyers, 21; submarines, 10; total, 31; combined totals, 255 torpedo vessels and submarines built and building.

GREAT BRITAIN'S NAVAL PROGRAMME

for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1904, is well under way and comprises three 16,350-ton battle ships, four 13,550-ton armored cruisers, three 3,000-ton protected cruisers, 4 scouts of 2,900 tons each, and 10 submarines. England is also reconstructing and rearming her armored war ships, some even of as late a date as 1890.

KINDS OF SHIPS.

Great Britain's policy, as displayed by percentages, shows that of her ships built 25 per cent are first-class battle ships, 3 per cent second-class battle ships, 13 per cent armored cruisers, 10 per cent protected cruisers, 26 per cent protected cruisers, second class, and other cruisers and scouts 22 per cent.

She is building 21 per cent first-class battle ships, 37 per cent armored cruisers, 20 per cent protected cruisers, second class, and 22 per cent other cruisers and scouts. The great battle ship and armored cruiser appear in England to receive the most of the appropriations for increase of the matériel.

FRANCE'S SEA STRENGTH.

France has built 20 first-class battle ships, with a tonnage of 223,621; 20 other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads, with a tonnage of 94,615, armored cruisers, 15, with tonnage of 113,757; 4 protected cruisers, first class, with tonnage of 31,513; 19 protected cruisers, second class, with tonnage of 79,752, and 18 other cruisers and scouts, with tonnage of 32,840. Her total number of ships built is 96, and they have a tonnage of 576,108. France is building 6 first-class battle ships, with a tonnage of 87,800, and 8 armored cruisers, of 91,849 tonnage, making a total of 14 ships and 179,649 tons building.

France's torpedo vessels and submarines built are: Destroyers, 25; torpedo boats, 20; submarines, 30, making 315 in all. She is building 13 destroyers, 30 torpedo boats, and 10 submarines, a total of 53 building and a grand total of 368.

The naval programme of France for 1904 consists of 1 armored cruiser, of 13,644 tons; 2 destroyers, of 335 tons each; 51 torpedo boats, and 16 submarines. In the number of ships built France has about the same percentage for each class as England, but in ships building 43 per cent consists of first-class battle ships and 57 per cent armored cruisers. France leads the world in number of torpedo vessels and submarines built and building.

RUSSIA.

Russia has built 17 first-class battle ships, of tonnage 201,129; 12 second-class battle ships, of tonnage 66,679; 8 armored cruisers, of tonnage 71,261; 6 first-class protected cruisers, of tonnage 39,546; 5 second-class protected cruisers, of tonnage 19,450, and 11 other cruisers and scouts, of tonnage 18,063, making a total of 59 ships and a tonnage of 416,158.

Russia is building 8 first-class battle ships, of 112,864 tons; 3 protected cruisers, first class, of 19,965 tons; and 3 protected cruisers, second class, of 9,445 tons, making a total of 14 ships building, with tonnage of 142,274. Her total number built and building is 73 ships, of 558,432 tons.

Russia's torpedo craft built consists of 49 destroyers, 165 torpedo boats, 1 submarine; and she is building 9 destroyers, 5 torpedo boats, and no submarines, making a total of 229 built and building.

Russia's last programme consisted of two 16,500-ton battle ships, two 6,750-ton armored cruisers, and a number of torpedo boats. Russia appears to have a policy of building battle ships and cruisers to the practical exclusion of other types generally.

Germany leads United States in ships by 8, and with more than 93,469 tons, having 14 first-class battle ships, of 152,581 tons; 16 second-class battle ships, of 90,773 tons; 3 armored cruisers, of 28,144 tons; 9 protected cruisers, second class, of 48,949 tons, and 31 other cruisers and scouts, of 69,427 tons, making a total of 73 ships of 387,914 tons built. She is building 6 first-class battle ships, of 77,982 tons; 3 armored cruisers, of 28,048 tons; 4 other cruisers and scouts, of 11,715 tons; making a total building of 13 ships, with tonnage of 117,745.

Germany has 32 torpedo-boat destroyers, 93 torpedo boats, and is building 12 destroyers and 3 submarines, making a total built and building of 140.

The new construction of Germany is pursuant to a plan adopted in 1900, which provides for ships to be built by 1917, as follows: 38 battle ships, 14

large cruisers, 38 small cruisers, of which there were in existence in 1900, 27 battle ships, 12 large cruisers, 29 small cruisers. The law provides for gradually replacing 17 battle ships, 10 large cruisers, and 29 small cruisers with new construction.

Germany appropriated under this law for 1904, for 2 battle ships, 1 armored cruiser, 3 cruisers, 1 gunboat, and 6 high-sea torpedo boats. Germany has a consistent policy by which the battle ship predominates, and very little is expended in smaller ships in comparison. Germany also provides for a gradual increase in personnel in an exact ratio to ships laid down, so that she can officer and man each ship when ready.

UNITED STATES NAVY.

The Navy consists of 11 first-class battle ships of 125,129 tons; 12 second-class battle ships and coast-defense ironclads of 47,945 tons; 2 armored cruisers of 17,415 tons; 2 protected cruisers of 14,750 tons; 15 second-class protected cruisers of 56,393 tons, and 23 other cruisers of 32,773 tons; making a total of 65 ships and 294,405 tons built.

The United States is building 11 first-class battle ships of 160,700 tons; 8 armored cruisers of 111,800 tons; 3 protected cruisers of 28,800 tons; 4 second-class protected cruisers of 12,400 tons, and 2 other cruisers and scouts of 2,170 tons; making a total building of 28 and tonnage of 321,870. Built and building the United States has 93 ships of 616,275 tons.

United States torpedo boats and submarines consist of 16 destroyers, 30 torpedo boats, and 8 submarines, 4 torpedo boats are being built, making a total of 53 torpedo boats built and building.

Our naval programme, as just recommended by the General Board and endorsed by Secretary Moody to the House Naval Committee, consists of 1 battle ship, 1 armored cruiser, 3 protected cruisers, 4 scouts, and 2 squadron colliers.

Our policy in the past, as shown by ships built, indicates a percentage of 17 per cent for battle ships, 18 per cent second-class battle ships and ironclads, 3 per cent armored cruisers, 3 per cent protected cruisers, 23 per cent protected cruisers, second class, and 35 per cent scouts, etc. We are building 40 per cent battle ships, 29 per cent armored cruisers, 10 per cent protected cruisers, 18 per cent protected cruisers, second class, and 7 per cent scouts.

The General Board recommendation in percentage means: 9 per cent battle ships, 9 per cent armored cruiser, 27 per cent protected cruiser, 36 per cent protected cruiser, second class, and 18 per cent small craft.

This is a noteworthy reversal in the United States policy. It is evident that the United States does not follow Germany's great battle-ship plan, but prefers to have more and smaller ships for the appropriations voted by Congress. Italy, Japan, and Austria have 44 ships of 329,257 tons, 47 of 253,681 tons, and 27 of 149,833 tons, respectively.

COMPLETED NAVIES.

If all vessels in navies were completed, the order would be, in tons: Great Britain, 1,867,250; France, 755,757; United States, 616,275; Russia, 558,432; Germany, 605,619; Italy, 329,257; Japan, 253,681, and Austria, 149,833.

The United States is third in the world's navies, considering ships built and building, and fifth in ships built. We are building at the present time 15 ships, with tonnage of 204,025 more than Germany, and 14 ships, with tonnage of 179,566 more than Russia. Germany has 36 battle ships and coast-defense ironclads built and building, and the United States 24, while the United States has 10 armored cruisers and Germany 6.

Russia has 37 battle ships and 8 armored cruisers. It is evident that in great fighting battle ships and cruisers, Russia, the United States, and Germany are about equal, and that the United States takes the third place through second-class protected cruisers and scouts, which would be of inferior use and power in a naval conflict with a great nation.

The principal ships built and building for the powerful navies are shown in this comparative table:

Country.	Battle ships.	Second-class battle ships and ironclads.	Armored cruisers.	Protected cruisers, first class.	Protected cruisers, second class.	Other cruisers, scouts.	Total.
Great Britain.....	59	6	41	21	60	52	239
France.....	26	20	23	4	19	18	110
Russia.....	25	12	8	9	8	11	73
Germany.....	20	16	6	-----	9	35	86
United States.....	22	12	10	5	19	25	93
Italy.....	19	3	6	-----	5	11	44
Japan.....	6	3	8	-----	13	17	47
Austria.....	3	13	3	-----	2	6	27

The CHAIRMAN. If no other gentleman desires to speak, the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is popular to advocate a big navy. Its achievements are justly the source of pride and gratification for the American people. The traditional policy of the Government to rely upon a sea force for defense rather than to maintain a large standing army, as well as the complete isolation of our territory from the great powers, have operated to develop a sentiment favorable to an increase of our naval force.

The pending bill contains much for serious consideration. In a time of profound peace it carries appropriations for the naval service which aggregate \$96,833,033.94. For pay of the Navy and for the Marine Corps there is provided \$23,734,866.28; on account of new construction, armor, and armament, \$31,826,860; and the balance is for repairs, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, supplies, equipments, ordnance, and public works at various naval stations, and for the Naval Academy.

This bill carries \$14,461,247.51 more than the bill for the current fiscal year.

Since 1890 the naval expenditures have amounted to the sum of \$644,523,789.98. With the amount appropriated by the pending bill the expenditures will have aggregated at the end of the coming fiscal year \$740,861,837.92. To complete vessels already authorized will require \$50,891,699, and for the increase authorized by this bill \$29,885,000 more; in all, \$80,776,699.

These figures give some idea of the enormous expenditures required for the Navy. From June 30, 1898, to June 30, 1905, provided that the amount carried by this bill is expended, the expenditures for the Navy will aggregate \$500,512,654.43. I have here a statement showing the annual appropriations for the Navy for each year ending June 30, from 1890. This statement is prepared by the Treasury Department. In 1890 the appropriation was \$21,675,374.98. Increases have been made from year to year until the present appropriation of \$96,338,038.94 is submitted for consideration.

It is legitimate to inquire at this time, What is meant by a big navy? To what extent is our naval force to be increased? What object is in view, and what is to be accomplished by the additions contemplated? I realize, Mr. Chairman, that there may be some who will take this as an opportunity to charge me with that new form of disloyalty becoming so rife in the country. To suggest that there can be something better, to intimate that the administration of public affairs may possibly be improved, or to inquire for reasons that prompt certain actions by the Executive, or by the dominant party, is looked upon in some quarters as disloyalty—a sort of treason to the country, or, at all events, to the Administration. At the risk of having this charge made, I shall press the inquiry already suggested.

It is not so long since it was usual to intimate that the new construction authorized each year for the Navy should be sufficient to keep the shipyards of the country busy. The unfortunate disclosures in the recent investigation of the shipbuilding trust effectively hushes that argument. Congress has not made a definite declaration of what would constitute an adequate sea force. I have been unable to find in the reports from the Navy Department any recommendation as to what the naval force should ultimately consist. Should not some consideration be given to that question now that the annual appropriation has reached the \$100,000,000 mark?

To whoever can read the signs of the times the programme of this Government is plain. I am aware that official denial will be quickly forthcoming; nevertheless, I assert that the action of this Government in its naval programme is unmistakably to procure a naval force that will exceed that of Germany. At present this country has eleven first-class battle ships of 125,129 tons, and is building eleven more of 166,700 tons; twelve other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads of 47,945 tons; two armored cruisers of 17,415 tons, and in the course of construction eight of 111,800 tons; two protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000), of 14,750 tons; three building of 28,800 tons; fifteen protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons), 56,393 tons; four building, 12,400 tons; twenty-three other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000), 32,773; two building, 2,170; or, when all the vessels now under construction are completed, the United States will have ninety-three of 616,275 tons.

Germany has fourteen first-class battle ships of 152,531 tons; six building, 77,982 tons; sixteen other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads of 90,773 tons; three armored cruisers, 28,144; three building, 28,048; nine protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons), of 46,949 tons; thirty-one other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons) of 69,427; four building of 11,715 tons; in all, when completed, eighty-six vessels of 505,619 tons.

The celebrated 1900 naval programme of Germany calls for thirty-eight battle ships, fourteen large cruisers, and thirty-eight small cruisers. At the time the programme was adopted she had twenty-seven battle ships, twelve large cruisers, twenty-seven small cruisers. The law then enacted provided for the gradual replacement by new construction of seventeen battle ships, ten large cruisers, and twenty-nine small cruisers. It is the opinion of naval experts who have analyzed this programme, however, that by the year 1917, up to which time the programme extends, Germany will then have a greater force than that laid down on paper. This will be due to the fact that the ships replaced will not be at all entirely obsolete, and to the further fact that additional authorizations are expected from time to time, it now being understood that five additional battle ships will this year be authorized for foreign service.

In a hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs on the 4th of the present month Admiral Dewey, speaking of the proper size of our sea force, says that it should consist of forty-eight battle ships and half as many armored cruisers. This is the opinion of the general board which has been considering the scheme for three years. The Admiral in his statement uses this significant language:

I think we ought to be a little ahead of any country that is likely to attack us. I think if we were to have forty-eight battle ships in twenty years they would let us alone.

This statement, Mr. Chairman, confirms my assertion that our naval programme, so far as it has been formulated at all, is based upon the theory that our naval force should be greater than that of Germany. And that apparently is the only consideration given

any serious thought, for this programme will leave us still slightly behind France and somewhat ahead of Germany.

If this country is to aim at such a navy as the Admiral has in mind, should it not be given careful consideration at this time? Who is prepared to say that the policies of our Government, or even its necessities, require that at the end of twenty years this country shall have a navy practically equal in power to that now possessed by Great Britain? It means the expenditure of at least \$350,000,000 additional for construction outside of the \$80,776,699 required for the vessels under construction and authorized by this bill, and an enlisted force of at least 100,000 men.

Great Britain has to-day fifty first-class battle ships and nine in the course of construction, with a total tonnage of 811,600 tons. She has twenty-seven armored cruisers and fourteen building, with a total tonnage of 428,800 tons. Her policy is easily understood, for it has been definitely admitted and pursued for many years. It is her policy to have a navy equal to that of the combined navies of any other two powers that can possibly be arrayed against her. Yet last spring a protest was made in the House of Commons against the tremendous burdens that were being imposed upon the people by reason of her enormous naval programme. From the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs it appears that France has reached the limit of her expenditures, yet there can be no decrease, but there must be, for various reasons, a continued increase in her naval expenditures.

This country has undertaken a naval programme which, although never formulated by authority, yet is as definite as that of any other power. Is it fear that prevents a declaration by the naval authorities or by Congress that our Navy must ultimately be as great as that which Great Britain now has, with the consequent burdens upon the people? Is it fear that such a declaration would meet with instant disapproval by the country? What would be done with such a navy after it were built? I have searched carefully for some declaration on this subject. The information obtainable is of the most meager character. On January 25, 1904, the only statement on the subject which I have been able to find was made by Captain Pillsbury to the Naval Committee. In reply to a question as to what he would do with forty-eight battle ships, and how that number was determined, he said:

That is a great question. We are thinking we ought to have a squadron on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic. Sixteen vessels of the battle-ship kind will form a fleet, and of course there will always be more or less vessels actually under repair all the time. By the time we get these forty-eight some of the first built will have gone into the reserve squadron; the *Indiana* and vessels of that class, for example, they would be in reserve. These forty-eight battle ships after construction would be in the first and second lines.

This statement confirms my assertion that eventually our Navy will equal Great Britain's present force. At present Great Britain has fifty first-class battle ships of above 10,000 tons displacement and not more than twenty years old. Of these thirty-four are in commission, attached to mobile squadrons; four are in commission undergoing trials; twelve are out of commission undergoing repairs.

Is it unreasonable, then, to ask more definite information than that now obtainable for our naval programme? It may be unpopular to raise a question as to the propriety of our naval expenditures; but to me it appears a matter of greatest moment, which should not be shirked because contrary to what is supposed to be a popular fancy.

It is time to call a halt upon much talk of an inflammatory character that is heard throughout this land. Public officials are the chief offenders by loose, indefinite, and bombastic statements. The Naval Committee, in its report, is not entirely free from the disease. It says:

If we judge public sentiment aright, it is in favor of the continuance of the policy of building up our Navy. If we stop now, we would be left behind the leading countries of the world.

The American people will not indorse the policy of sacrificing the American Navy for internal improvements, nor is there any such necessity.

Foremost and above all must stand considerations of national defense, maintenance of our foreign policy, and protection of American citizens everywhere. The American people are not willing to lessen their influence in this hemisphere nor forsake their interests on the other.

This language in no wise justifies the programme which has undoubtedly been formulated by those whose opinions will continue to dominate the action of the committee. More significant is the language of another part of the report:

The rapidly developing complications of the whole eastern situation demand that our Navy shall be made as effective as possible.

Why? What have we to fear except the impetuosity of our present Executive? The Secretary of the Navy, in a speech before the New England Rubber Club on February 17, 1904, said:

We are at peace with all countries; we wish to continue, and will continue in that happy relation if honest diplomacy and just regard for the rights of every nation will maintain peace, but we must provide a Navy, so as to provide for war. If we are strong enough to enforce the Monroe doctrine, we shall never have to do it.

This is another of those newly discovered doctrines which sound strangely to the American people. It is quite recent in its origin.

It smacks peculiar to hear it asserted, as it was recently in this House by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE], that "the Monroe doctrine is as big as the American Navy, and no bigger." Such was not the theory upon which a Democratic Administration proceeded. President Cleveland would never have written his universally praised Venezuelan message, which compelled Great Britain, the greatest naval power in the world, to accede to the wishes of our people in the Venezuelan controversy if he had stopped to measure the relative strength of the navies of the two countries. There is a greater power than mere brute force. It influences the actions of nations as well as of individuals. Justice and right have not been entirely eliminated from the codes that regulate nations in their dealings with one another. The safety of a nation, no more than of the individual, is not assured because it swaggers about as a veritable perambulating arsenal.

Mr. Moody, in his speech just referred to, strikes the dominant note of the advocates of a great navy when he says:

This is a great country and can afford a great Navy, and the world must know that we are at all times ready for war.

This is a great country, Mr. Chairman. It can afford to pay for a great navy. It can not afford to be the swashbuckler of the nations. It can not afford to have a great navy merely because other nations have them. It must have whatever naval force is needed for the defense of the country, without consideration of what might be useful in wars of aggrandizement and of conquest. Is our power and influence among the nations of the world to depend merely upon and to be coterminous with our naval force? Admit that, and what excuse shall there be to omit to provide an army the like of which the world has never seen? It follows logically that the effectiveness of the Navy would be greatly enhanced by immense armies to follow up its work.

There is a growing feeling of unrest in this country. There is an almost universal belief even among its friends that the present Administration is dominated by an unsafe man. In all sections of the country the conviction, rightly or wrongly, is firm that the present occupant of the White House is apt to involve us in war with some other nation. The same belief has been had with respect to the head of another great nation; which may account for the fact that at a dinner on Lincoln's birthday, at Grand Rapids, Mich., the highest compliment that Baron Von Sternburg, the German ambassador, thought he could pay to President Roosevelt was to declare that he very greatly resembled the Emperor of Germany.

If the prevailing belief is justified, and if the President is to be given four years of power in his own right, now that the great representative of the conservative forces in the Republican party, the late respected and beloved Senator from Ohio, Mr. Hanna, is gone to his reward, it may be wise for us to outdo even Great Britain in our naval programme. Is it the part of wisdom to encourage an unsafe and impetuous and adventure-loving Executive by loose talk and with big appropriations? Should he not be made to feel that the sentiment of this country is for peace, not for strife? It always has been so, and it always should be.

Since the Spanish-American war, it is true, the people seem to have been carried away with the glamour of military achievements. The spirit of the "man on horseback," for so many years so sore an affliction to the people of France, apparently stalks unrestrained throughout the land. A shrewdly conducted movement was initiated about two years ago to cultivate a public sentiment in favor of a mighty navy. Many prominent men whose business interests were closely identified with the shipbuilding industries then banded together for the avowed purpose of popularizing vast expenditures for the naval service. So stupendous have the expenditures for the naval and military establishments become that important and needed public improvements have been indefinitely deferred.

With significant frequency it is asked: Is it wise that we should emulate the overburdened and sorely tried nations of the Old World with lavish and unnecessary expenditures? Germany, France, Russia, and Italy, great camps of armed men, are impoverished by their enormous military and naval establishments; and yet they continue to heap heavy burdens upon their people in a vain effort to outdo one another in their naval programmes. There is no logic in the statement or in the belief that it is necessary for us to keep abreast of Germany's naval force. Why should this country enter the mad scramble to be equipped for universal war? There is no nation so rash to seek conflict with us. Are we to have a great navy merely to furnish summer holidays that high officials may play at war? Or is this nation to become the braggart, cowering and unjustly coercing the weak and defiantly taunting the strong from conflict?

Such is not the mission of this Republic. Since its establishment it has been the asylum of the oppressed, the downtrodden, and of the persecuted; it has been an inspiration for the unfortu-

nate of every clime; it has been the protector of the weak, shielding them from the cupidity of stronger nations whenever interference was justifiable. Brave men freely shed their blood that there might be established here a government that would be a beacon of liberty, whose rays would penetrate the darkest and gloomiest corners of the universe and bring hope and good cheer to those made despondent by the tyrant's rule. Our vast domain shelters countless thousands made happy and prosperous in this land of plenty because of the beneficent character of its institutions. Our way is the way of peace. In our path should be scattered the blessings of a government of free men. Our flag should not carry terror with it, nor be received with maledictions. It should be emblematic of liberty, of security, and of peace for all men. [Loud applause.]

APPENDIX.

Annual appropriations made by Congress for the Navy, for each year ending June 30, from 1890 to 1903, as prepared by the Treasury Department:

1890.....	\$21,675,374.98	1900.....	\$48,099,999.53
1891.....	23,136,065.53	1901.....	61,140,916.67
1892.....	31,541,645.78	1902.....	78,101,791.00
1893.....	23,543,296.65	1903.....	78,856,863.13
1894.....	22,104,061.38	1904.....	81,876,791.43
1895.....	25,366,826.72	1905 (carried by the	
1896.....	29,416,077.31	pending bill).....	96,338,038.94
1897.....	30,562,680.95		
1898.....	33,003,234.19	Total.....	740,861,837.92
1899.....	56,098,783.68		

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GUDGER].

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, for the last half century the laboring people of this nation have toiled and struggled under the burden of heavy taxes, direct or indirect, and the result of this is that millions of dollars have been and are now stored in the National Treasury. This money is to be spent for defraying the current expenses of the Government or for appropriations for public purposes. These appropriations cover a wide range of objects, but there is one, however, which always carries millions of dollars—it is for rivers and harbors, to improve the waterways of this country. Hand in hand with this should be a like appropriation for the improvement of the public highways of this country, and to-day, in the name of the farmers of western North Carolina, in the name of the farmers of this Union, I ask and urge that an annual appropriation be made to assist in opening up and building public highways for the use and benefit of the agricultural and every other class of our population.

I have the honor of representing one of the most, if not the most, beautiful and picturesque mountain districts in the whole country. Our streams burst from the mountain glens and trickle into the sylvan valleys; they unite and, finally, form the Swannanoa, French Broad, Tuckasegee, Hiwassee, and other rivers, but none of these have been improved by an appropriation from the National Government; in fact, any effort would subtract from the handiwork of nature. Mine is an inland district where mountains lift their gigantic heads to such altitude that from Mitchells Peak and Pisgah's dome a view may be had of four different States.

My people are an agricultural people. They belong to that class who have ever borne their burden of taxation without a murmur. They have witnessed the appropriation of the money paid by them as taxes for any purpose that a majority in this Congress might decide to appropriate the same for, and never yet have they protested. My district has been a political as well as a geographic part of this country since the days of the thirteen original colonies. Her quota of men in arms were at Kings Mountain, Cowpens, New Orleans, and in Mexico. During the civil war she had more men under Lee, Jackson, Johnson, and Pettigrew than she had voters. In every great crisis of our country's history she has bled for the right, as God gave her light to see it.

During all this time my district has not had, as I now recall, one single dollar as an appropriation for any public purpose, except one small item for erecting a Federal court and post-office building at Asheville, N. C., and this same building is now in need of repairs, and I am asking of the present Congress an appropriation to cover the expense of same.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that in the name of 30,000 farmers of western North Carolina I urge and request the appropriation of funds to aid in the construction of public highways, the most pressing need of the farmers of this country.

The farming class, composing as they do one-third of our citizenship, and the product of whose labor annually represents more than the combined coal and iron industries, have fought the battles of life heroically under adverse conditions, and have at all times been the protecting wall of this nation.

At present we have under consideration the vast appropriation

of our Government for opening up the isthmian canal. This will unite the two great oceans, opening up a waterway which will so develop our resources that we will rank first in commercial importance among the nations of the world. This gigantic scheme is estimated to cost \$500,000,000, money to be spent in a tropical country, which will benefit us but little except in the commercial results obtained. This canal, when completed, will open up a tidal wave of trade in the South that will, in my judgment, change the business centers of this nation.

Admitting the urgent necessity of this canal and the expediency of its early completion, still an equal sum of money if spent upon the public roads of this country would give to each county or parish in the United States at least 50 miles of macadam road, and this money so expended would pass through the channels of trade, benefiting the class who have paid more money and received less in return than any other class of our citizenship, and would ultimately return to our Treasury. If the wish of the substantial farmer could be realized and a first-class macadam road could be built from each county seat in four different directions—east, west, north, and south—the effect would be magical and a new world of industry, energy, and internal development would be opened up to the tiller of the soil.

The total sum for transportation of farm products, lumber, etc., to the railroads is \$1,000,000,000 annually. A careful investigation discloses the fact that the average cost of transporting a ton over a mile of ordinary country road is 25 cents, while a conservative estimate shows that over a good macadam road the cost is but 10 cents per ton, thus saving to the farmer \$800,000,000 annually. This enormous saving would amply repay the appropriations made by the Government. This estimate is based upon the idea of a complete system of roadways all over the United States. Congress has recently appropriated to the St. Louis exposition nearly \$10,000,000; for rivers and harbors there has been expended more than \$500,000,000, and the appropriation at this session of Congress will in all probability be something like \$60,000,000. While these appropriations are greatly needed and have combined to make this country the leading commercial nation of the world, it is now an opportune time to begin a system of road building by national aid that will make us the greatest agricultural nation of the world.

The surplus in the National Treasury is more than \$225,000,000, money which has been collected from the people of the United States, and which should be turned back into the channels of trade by making needed improvements rather than have this enormous sum of money idle in the Treasury or used by rich banking corporations without their paying any interest to the Government. The banks now have of this surplus sum \$140,000,000.

No farmer ever objects to the payment of taxes when he gets value received; but conditions are such that it matters not who much tax he pays he can not build these roads without assistance from the National Government. This building of highways is no fanciful scheme, it is no speculation, it is no dream, but it is a substantial necessity. It is impossible to estimate the advantages of good roads; it makes distances unimportant; it enables the farmers to market their products at a minimum cost, thus doing for them what we have done for every other class of our citizenship, and preventing the exodus of our best young men from the farms to seek a clerkship in a city and dwarf the greatest vocation open to development, for we should remember "that the farmer is the man that feeds them all." Good roads are an educational as well as a commercial necessity. Count the weary miles of muddy roads that the farm boy and girl may walk to reach the rural schoolhouse and compare this with the few blocks of paved streets that the city boy and girl walk to reach the magnificent graded school system, and remember that a mile of macadam road in the country will make this trip to the schoolhouse a pleasure; it will make the farmer's load to market lighter; it will lift him out of the mud and mire. It will do for him what the great Jefferson inaugurated in the beginning of our country's history.

The public highways do not belong to the farmer; they are the property of the public and are used by the pleasure seeker, the rich, the poor, the producer, and the nonproducer alike, and yet the farmer has had and still has the burden of building and keeping them in repair. This is wrong, and there should be no discrimination, but every citizen, through the Government, should aid in building the public roads, and the burden should not longer be borne by the farmer alone.

It is useless to contend that actual progress will ever be made in the building and maintenance of a permanent extended system of macadam roads without the aid of the National Government. True, it may in some States be done, but in others it can not. The farmers of this country, with their present burden of direct and indirect taxation, are unable to bear this expense, and I am forced to believe that if a great national system is organized by

which from fifty to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars would annually be available for road purposes for ten years the construction of good roads will have reached that point where the income from the increased price in farm lands and the saving expense in marketing farm products will enable the farmer to carry this work to completion.

The city resident has his mails delivered at his door many times a day, but the farmer in most cases must travel miles to get his mail even once a day and in some cases thrice a week. This unequal advantage is caused by the inability to have a network of rural mail routes as the direct result of bad roads.

We have entered the threshold of a new century and should create not only for ourselves but millions yet unborn a system of public highways to be left as a heritage for the whole people. We now have an opportunity to assist the producer, the man who lives by the sweat of his brow, by giving him a well-regulated system of good roads, and this can only be done by national aid. This proposition is a practical and not a theoretical one. Money spent to improve the public roads of this country will benefit more people and promote internal development in a greater measure than for any other purpose. Education, civilization, and progress go hand in hand with good roads, and it is our plain duty to build them.

We have reached a point in our national history when under the present system of taxation millions of dollars will lie idle in the Treasury or be used free of charge by gigantic banking corporations or be expended for the benefit of those who paid the major portion of the same into the Treasury. In reviewing the history of large appropriations of money for various purposes, aggregating millions, we find that more than 60 per cent of it is contributed by the farmers of the United States; yet less than 10 per cent of it goes back into improvements designed for their benefit.

Of our export trade of \$1,400,000,000 the farmers of the country furnish nine hundred millions; in fact, the farmers form the bone and sinew of our country; they are the producers of the wealth of the nation and are entitled to recognition.

In all the bloody conflicts, both domestic and foreign, in which our people have engaged, the farmers have stood in the forefront of the firing line; they have responded at all times to their country's call, and have demonstrated their courage and patriotism on every battlefield, when to the battlefield was but to the grave; and it is the duty of this Congress to look upon this measure with favor, and by the inauguration of this system mark this as an epoch in the history of this country unparalleled in the development of industrial resources.

Large sums of money are constantly being raised and used for public purposes, and I do not wish to be understood as opposed to appropriations for rivers and harbors and other beneficial improvements which will promote progress and prosperity, but I intend to agitate the principal aid for roads and the just recognition of the farmers of this land alongside of and four square with any other appropriation for a public purpose.

The amount asked for of \$24,000,000, in my humble judgment, is insufficient as compared with the important work mapped out to be performed. Instead of \$24,000,000 annually, as provided for in the various bills now pending before Congress, we ought to make it \$50,000,000. This amount of money may seem extravagant, but when compared with appropriations of the last decade it sinks into insignificance.

The prime object of all legislation along this line and the reason for public appropriations are to aid the greatest number of people, thereby doing the most good, and it must be conceded that this proposition will give relief to more people than the same amount of money appropriated for any other public purpose. The building of hundreds of miles of first-class roads in each of the States of this Union would enhance the value of real estate, would enable the farmer to market his surplus with but little expense, and prove a blessing as well to the agricultural life. It would be a just recognition of those who have had so little in the past and yet have contributed their all to our nation's greatness, and I trust and believe that this all-important question will receive that consideration that its importance demands. We can have, we will have, we must have, better highways by national aid.

The intelligence, advancement, and prosperity of our country is demonstrated by the typical commodious country farmhouses, the rural school buildings, and the neat and magnificent churches found in every section of our land, evidences of a great Christian nation. It is left for this generation to inaugurate a system of road building by national aid that will ring around the world as the one essential work to make this the greatest country on the face of the globe—"man's paradise." [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on December 14

last I addressed the honorable Committee of the Whole House on my bill (H. R. 4482) entitled "An act for the relief of tobacco growers of the United States." I demonstrated then that our tobacco laws were so vexatious in their operation on the tobacco grower and those who purchased his leaf tobacco, and the right of a tobacco grower to stem and twist his own growth for sale or gift and to sell his growing crop, that the grower was abandoning this industry to avoid bankruptcy, which means that if the present laws remain intact millions of revenue will be lost to the Government.

If the relief which we ask is given to the tobacco growers and any person who deals or wants to deal in leaf tobacco, the tobacco growers' prosperity will be restored and the revenues remain in status quo, or practically so.

I have read some history and law, and studied both, but I say to you candidly that of all of the laws regulating the agriculturist and the products of the farm none are so oppressive, obnoxious, and vexatious to the farmer as those which control the tobacco grower and his tobacco crop, both in his hands and the hands of his purchaser. Indeed, gentlemen, they are brutal. This word appears inapt, but I use that word because it gives you the practical operation and effect of these laws in a word.

I shall discuss these laws. The bankrupt condition of the tobacco grower being confessed and undisputed, I shall show the laws and people lurking behind them are destroying this great interest. I shall shock you gentlemen, I am sure, when I read these laws to you and demonstrate their practical operation, unless you have done as I have, dug down through forty years of internal-revenue legislation and familiarized yourselves with this, the most complex portion of our jurisprudence.

From 1816 to July 1, 1862, we had no internal-revenue laws, the revenue report of 1897 informs us. Our present system of tobacco laws is based upon the parent act, July 1, 1862, which was repealed by the act of June 20, 1868, but portions of the latter act are still the law. All these acts were war measures of forty years ago. They were intended to be "temporary." They have become permanent, while recent amendatory enactments are destroying our tobacco-growing industry.

On March 28, 1862, the committee reported to the House a bill proposing a tax of 3 cents per pound, as follows:

On tobacco, leaf or stem, unmanufactured, 3 cents per pound: *Provided*, That the payment of this duty shall not exempt tobacco from a further duty when manufactured. (Globe, 2d sess. 37th Cong., part 2, p. 1439, column 2.)

This clause was stricken out by order of the committee which reported it.

Both the Committee of Ways and Means reporting this clause and the House refused to tax the farmer's leaf. They refused to tax his leaf and stemmed tobacco, and they called, as this clause reads, both leaf and stem "unmanufactured" tobacco and as exempt from additional tax until "manufactured." The present law declares stemmed tobacco "manufactured" in the hands of the grower if he sells or gives it away. It is "manufactured" in the hands of all other parties when they sell to consumers. Leaf tobacco is "manufactured" when thus sold under the present law if sold by anyone except the man who grows it. I will explain this more fully later.

Mr. Horton, in reporting the "clause," March 28, 1862, just alluded to, explained why Congress should not tax the leaf or stem. He said:

I move to strike out the whole of that paragraph, and I wish to state the reason for it. We found, Mr. Chairman, after a great deal of deliberation, and after taking the sense of the committee and the sense of the various interests in the country, that it would be better to levy all the tax on tobacco which we levy at all upon the manufactured article. All the taxes in this bill were levied upon the manufactured article, with the exception contained in this paragraph.

The committee have directed me to move to strike out this clause, thinking that thereby we will get as much revenue by increasing the tax upon the manufactured article. I hope that all the gentlemen who vote for striking this out will vote for putting the additional tax in the next paragraph—especially not excepting my colleague from the Monroe district [Mr. Morris].

This clause was stricken out and the tax increased from 5 to 10 cents upon "manufactured" tobacco, treated in the next clause of the bill.

I will read that clause:

On tobacco, cavendish, plug, twist, fine cut, and manufactured of all descriptions, not including snuff, cigars, or prepared smoking tobacco, 5 cents per pound.

The debate continued as follows:

Mr. HORTON. I move to amend that clause by inserting "ten" in place of "five."

The amendment was adopted.

When Congress, to prosecute a war, was framing a tariff bill, it refused to tax the farmer's leaf or his stemmed tobacco. Forty years thereafter, in time of peace, the farmer's own raising in the

leaf he can sell free of tax, but his purchaser, selling to a consumer, must pay a tax on that natural leaf, and the grower must pay a tax if he twists or stems his tobacco for sale or gift.

TAX ON HAND TWIST.

Congress levied a tax of 30 cents per pound on "hand-twisted" tobacco on March 3, 1865, to July 3, 1866 (but repealed the law within sixteen months). During this time, a year and four months, the revenue this law produced amounted to—

1865	\$7,802.77
1866	6,252.44
Total	14,055.21

Aggregate number of pounds taxed were 46,850. (See Internal Revenue Report, 1897, Table G, p. 395 Appendix, and Ex. Docs. Nos. 55 and 56, 2d sess. 39th Cong., p. 330, and Ex. Docs. Nos. 5 and 6, 2d sess. 40th Cong., pp. 86 to 97 and 337.)

TAX ON HAND TWIST, ETC., AND FINE CUT.

From July 13, 1866, to July 20, 1868 (twenty months), Congress levied a tax of 24 cents per pound on "hand twist, etc., and fine cut." The whole tax for the twenty months amounted to \$520,451.69. For the year 1867 it was only \$231,730.38. Aggregate number of pounds (taxed, of course), 1,734,839. This is verified by the authorities just cited.

When "hand twist" was taxed separate and alone, as in 1865 and 1866, the revenue therefrom was a mere song—\$14,055—and even when "hand twist, etc., and fine cut" (combined) are taxed for twenty months at 24 cents per pound the tax is only \$520,451.

These rates were 30 cents and 24 cents per pound. The rate under the present law, if the farmer stems or twists his tobacco for sale, is 6 cents, or one-fifth and one-fourth, respectively, of the rates of 1865 and 1866 and 1866 to 1868.

The tax on manufactured tobacco, whether done by hand or machine, is 6 cents per pound. We want the farmer given the right to "hand" twist, free of tax license and limitations, his own growth of leaf tobacco.

If when Congress in 1865 taxed "hand twist" at 30 cents per pound and received only \$7,802 tax, surely but little revenue will be diverted from the Treasury if the grower is allowed to hand twist his own growth for gift or sale when the tax is 6 cents. In 1865 at 6 cents tax per pound the revenues would have amounted to a little over \$1,300.

We want the grower to be allowed to "hand" stem his own growth free of tax or limitation. He is required now to pay a tax of 6 cents per pound if he stems to sell or give away. The grower can stem or twist his own growth free of tax for his own personal use. He can not give it away to his son, his wife, his daughter, his son-in-law, to the church, or charity without paying a tax of 6 cents.

COST OF PRODUCTION.

In Tennessee and Kentucky dark-tobacco districts it cost last year 6 cents per pound to raise tobacco, and it is selling, when sold at all, to-day in Robertson County, Tenn., at 3½ cents per pound on an average.

MANUFACTURING—WHAT IS.

Under the present law, if the grower changes the "natural condition" of his own growth and raising of tobacco, by hand or machine, for gift or sale, he must pay a tax of 6 cents per pound. (The change wrought by curing, of course, is not manufacturing.) This, mind you, is the law, if the grower manipulates even his own growth. He is not allowed to buy other growers' tobacco without qualifying as a dealer or manufacturer.

There is no such thing as free trade in leaf tobacco. There is free trade in corn, wheat, and other agricultural products. We want leaf tobacco in any and all persons' hands untaxed, unrestricted—free trade, in other words, in leaf tobacco in the hands of anyone. As it is, all persons except the grower with his own crop must pay a tax of 6 cents per pound to sell to consumers. But little, if any, leaf tobacco is thus sold. Leaf tobacco is consumed mostly by the manufacturer and in exporting.

As there is little or no leaf tobacco sold to consumers by non-producers, but little revenue, if any, would be diverted from the Treasury if the nonproducer were allowed to sell the leaf to consumers. This is one limitation we want removed. The other limitation is, we want the grower and all other persons to be allowed to sell and deal in leaf tobacco, the tax to be placed entirely on the manufactured product.

GROWER MUST DELIVER IN PERSON.

The grower can sell to anybody his own growth and raising without any limitations whatever, except he is required to deliver his own growth and raising to his purchaser. He can not delegate this a "privilege." His son, his wife, his daughter, or

his son-in-law can not deliver for him. His agent can only "solicit" sales for the grower. If the grower employs a "registered dealer" as his agent, such agent can only sell to three classes, to wit, other leaf dealers, manufacturers, and exporters, while the grower can sell to anybody anywhere. In other words, he can't employ an agent to do what he (the grower) can do. Think of that, gentlemen! The grower must deliver in person. His ancient common-law right to act by and through his agent as fully as if he were present and acting in person is destroyed. That is what I call a savage, brutal law. Requiring him to deliver in person is another. If the grower is blind, deaf, dumb, without legs and arms, is insane, an invalid, or feeble from old age, which will overtake all of us, no matter, he must deliver in person directly to the purchaser.

Mr. FLOOD. Leaf tobacco?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; leaf tobacco of his own growth and raising at that. He must deliver it himself "directly to the purchaser." Gentlemen, every proposition of law that I have stated, or shall state hereafter, is borne out by the law itself, which I have here on my desk, and numerous opinions delivered by our very accommodating and able Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Yerkes, and his assistants in construing these laws.

The ordinary agent can solicit "sales" for the grower. He must be paid a salary. He can not be employed on "commission" even. The registered dealer acting as agent must be paid "a commission," but even he can only sell to the three classes I have named—dealer, manufacturer, and exporter.

GROWING CROP TAXED IF RESOLD.

If the grower sells his crop in the stalk, growing in the ground, to another person, that person must pay a tax of 6 cents per pound if he sells to consumers! That is the law laid down by Congress and thus construed by Commissioner Yerkes. Six cents per pound tax on the growing stalk, the growing leaf! The tax itself is prohibitory. The law is prohibitory. Why? Can you weigh growing stalks of tobacco by the pound? Whoever heard of such a proposition? But it's the law. Here is what Commissioner Yerkes wrote April 7, 1902, to C. F. Werndon, Wingold, Ky. (Treasury Decision 497):

The office has decided that where a grower of tobacco sells his crop before it is severed from the land, to another person, the purchaser shall not be privileged to resell the tobacco to consumers without payment of a tax.

Reading these laws, gentlemen, clearly convinces me that it was the intention of somebody somewhere to hobble the tobacco grower and turn him over to the manufacturer, the dealer, and the exporter. The American tobacco trust and the Regie contract people have formed a tobacco trust in Europe and are operating within the United States. Under these laws they are able to control and do control the personal liberty of the grower and the price of his tobacco. They dictate the price. The law dictates the way the leaf shall be sold and to whom sold. It practically forces the grower to submit at any price, like a whipped slave. The grower's freedom of action is destroyed. The purchaser of his leaf is practically dictated by the law, and that purchaser is the tobacco trust lurking behind the wall these laws have built.

Did you ever hear of a law that was calculated to hobble any class of workmen or laborers that more completely succeeded than this? The grower and his agent of both kind are restricted. Under no circumstances can the ordinary agent deliver. He simply solicits. The "dealer" as agent can sell to only three classes. The grower must deliver directly to the purchaser, however aged he is. The son, however filial, is denied the privilege of delivering or waiting on his old blind father or crippled mother or his infant sister or brother, growers of tobacco.

A few days ago, in reply to my letter, the Acting Commissioner, Wilson, wrote me as follows:

The farmer and grower is unrestricted in the sale or other disposition of tobacco in its natural condition of his own growth and raising. This privilege, however, is a personal one and can not be delegated by the farmer to an agent or other person to sell and deliver the tobacco for him. An agent may find the customer and take orders for sale of the tobacco, but the farmer must make the delivery. (See Treasury Decision No 497, dated April 7, 1902, a copy of which was furnished you in a letter addressed to you on the 3d instant.)

I will here stop to read the opinion, No. 497, of Commissioner Yerkes to Mr. Herndon, already alluded to, and make my comment general as I proceed.

Here is the law:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1903.

SIR: In your letter dated the 2d instant you present several questions concerning the sale of leaf tobacco by and for farmers who raise the tobacco or

who receive the same from tenants or who buy the same while it is growing in the fields, and also whether a number of farmers may employ an agent to travel from place to place and sell the tobacco for them.

In reply you are informed that a farmer or grower of tobacco may sell tobacco of his own growth or raising, or that which he receives from his tenants as rent for land, without restriction as to the quantity sold or the business of the person to whom the tobacco is sold and delivered. This privilege is one which the farmer or grower can not delegate to another person.

The office has decided that where a grower of tobacco sells his crop before it is severed from the land to another person the purchaser would not be privileged to resell the tobacco to consumers without payment of the tax.

A farmer or grower of tobacco may place his tobacco in the hands of a qualified dealer in leaf tobacco to be sold by him on commission, and such dealer must sell the tobacco only to other qualified leaf dealers or to qualified manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or to persons who buy leaf tobacco in packages for export.

Any arrangement made by a farmer or a number of farmers with another person to sell and deliver his or their tobacco for him or them while traveling from place to place would be in violation of law. An agent who is paid a stipulated salary may travel and solicit orders for the sale of tobacco raised by another person, but he may not deliver the tobacco to purchasers, nor can he sell tobacco on commission or receive as compensation for his services the difference between the price as fixed by the farmer and the selling price.

All tobacco sold by an agent for the farmer who raised the tobacco must be delivered by the farmer, and not the agent, directly to the person who purchased the tobacco; and a farmer must sell his tobacco in the condition in which it was cured on the farm and can not stem, twist, plait, roll, sweeten, or otherwise manipulate it for sale to consumers.

Respectfully,

J. W. YERKES,
Commissioner.

Blind, deaf, dumb, without any arms or legs, overcome with old age or misfortune, he must make his own trade and deliver his own goods.

HIS AGENT IS LIMITED IN POWERS.

His right to employ an agent, his power under the common law and every other law short of savagery—the principal has the right to employ an agent and arm that agent with the power to represent the principal as fully as if the principal were present in person and acting himself. But he is robbed of that. His agent—I mean the ordinary or unregistered agent—can simply "solicit" sales, and the grower must pay him a fixed "salary." He can not let him sell on a commission; he must be paid a salary. That is the law laid down here by Mr. Yerkes in this opinion.

REGISTERED DEALER AS AGENT IS ALSO LIMITED IN POWER.

Now, he can employ a registered dealer to sell for him, but that registered dealer must be paid a "commission" (a tax), and although the tobacco grower can sell to anybody in the United States the registered dealer can not do any such thing, although he is the agent of the grower. He can only sell to registered dealers in leaf, to manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or to exporters of leaf in packages.

I will read from Treasury Decision 497 again:

A farmer or grower of tobacco may place his tobacco in the hands of a qualified dealer in leaf tobacco to be sold by him on commission, and such dealer must sell the tobacco to other (1) qualified leaf dealers, (2) manufacturers, and (3) to persons who put leaf tobacco in packages for export.

This is the law, gentlemen, although the principal of this agent—that is, the tobacco grower—can sell to anybody anywhere his own leaf which he raises. Thus the law limits even a legalized dealer acting as agent, while any other agent can only "solicit" sales. Thus the freedom of the grower and the law of agency are destroyed or so minimized as to practically imprison the grower and force the sale of his tobacco into the hands of purchasers whom the law points out.

Is not your sense of justice shocked at such a law, and does not this petition of the tobacco grower appeal to you, gentlemen? Can you deny his petition, that the liberty of the tobacco grower be restored to him; the law of agency be restored to him? Justice demands this. The farmer can sell his corn in the stalk, his wheat in the field, you know, without tax or limitation. You have done so; so have I. But the purchaser of the tobacco crop in the field growing must sell it by the pound at 6 cents, while it is yet in the stalk, if he sells to consumers. How does that strike you, gentlemen, for a just law? For a law that is calculated to aid the tobacco grower, or anything else on top of the earth, except the tobacco trust. The Government should blush if it has a conscience, with a face made of steel, at imposing such a law, or receiving revenues in such a manner!

The internal-revenue system has always been to our people obnoxious, vexatious, vicious, tyrannical, and exacting to the very last pound of flesh. But the people have borne it with a struggle, but murmuring all the time. They have lived along, kept out of the poorhouse, off the vagrant force, paid their taxes, submitted to the restrictions imposed on them, gave up one liberty after another, until in recent years they have been compelled to surrender. Labor, black and white, is leaving the tobacco fields, going to the cities, the railroads, and mining camps, while the tobacco grower, broken in spirit, bankrupt in money, without hope of relief, has turned from tobacco growing, a remunerative business previous

to a few years ago, and is now embarking in "truck" crops—gardening.

RECENT LAWS THAT ARE OBJECTIONABLE.

Several letters that I have here of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue show that section 69 of the act of August 28, 1894, and section 3 of the act approved April 12, 1902, are the objectionable laws, at least in part. I have here letters which the Commissioner sent me March 12, 1903, being copies of letters he had written to other parties. I will read them in full. They are short and plain:

J. P. DUNLAP, Esq.,
Dwight, Butler County, Nebr.

MARCH 6, 1903.

SIR: In your letter dated 28th ultimo, addressed to Mr. Hyde, you ask whether a person has the right to case tobacco for his own use only when none is sold or offered for sale.

In reply you are advised that section 69, act of August 28, 1894, provides that every person whose business it is to manufacture tobacco or snuff for himself, or who employs others to manufacture tobacco or snuff, whether such manufacture be by cutting, pressing, crushing, grinding, or otherwise preparing raw or leaf tobacco, shall be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco.

Section 3 of the act approved April 12, 1902, imposes a tax of 6 cents per pound on all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine-cut, cavendish, or other manufactured tobacco, and on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed when removed for consumption or use, or manufactured and removed for sale.

These several provisions of law are not construed as preventing a person from preparing his tobacco for his own personal use, and when none is sold or offered for sale or prepared for the use of other persons.

A farmer or grower is not privileged to stem, twist, roll, plait, sweeten, or otherwise change his tobacco for sale to consumers, and all tobacco so manipulated intended to be sold for consumption must be properly packed, labeled, and stamped by a qualified manufacturer of tobacco and as provided by regulation No. 8, pages 5 and 6, a copy of which is inclosed herewith for your further information.

Respectfully,

Commissioner.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, August 7, 1903.

C. E. MERIWETHER, Esq.,
Clarksville, Tenn.

SIR: In reply to your letter, dated 4th instant, you are advised that a farmer or grower may sell tobacco of his own growth and raising in its unmanufactured state without restriction as to the quantity sold or the place of sale or the business of the person who buys the tobacco.

No person can be employed by a farmer or grower to sell and deliver his tobacco for him, and all leaf tobacco so sold by a person for a farmer to consumers will be regarded as a manufactured tobacco, subject to tax under section 69, act of August 28, 1894.

Every person who sells tobacco in the fiber or natural leaf, and which is not of his own growth and raising, and who is not a registered dealer in leaf tobacco, will be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco under the aforesaid section, and is required to register his business and file a statement (Form 36) and execute a bond, on Form 40, the same as required of other manufacturers of tobacco, and thereafter put up and prepare all leaf tobacco intended to be sold to consumers in packages containing a statutory quantity of tobacco, the same as for smoking tobacco, or in wooden packages containing 10, 20, 40, or 60 pounds, as provided by regulations No. 8, page 23, a copy of which has been forwarded to your address under a separate cover.

Respectfully,

J. C. WHEELER, Deputy Commissioner.

You will see from these letters how the grower of tobacco is restricted; that when he sells stems or twists the tobacco he is a manufacturer of tobacco, and that he must box it up in a certain way, labeled and stamped. If he changes the natural condition of the tobacco except to cure, except for his own use, he is a manufacturer, and if he sells it changed from its natural condition it is manufactured, and he must box it up. The act of April 12, 1902, the latest law on the subject, I believe, requires him to box it up, etc., which is a burden—indeed, a prohibition. Mind you, now, this is the farmer's own growth that he must thus manipulate.

I addressed a letter to Commissioner Yerkes March 12, 1903, and his reply covers this question very thoroughly. The whole letter is printed in my former speech, and I hope you will all read it. I asked him seven questions categorically. Before I finish my speech I will give you all seven of the answers. I will now read five of them. Mr. Yerkes said:

From the foregoing premises I am constrained to answer your questions categorically, as follows:

1. That Congress has never imposed a tax on natural-leaf tobacco in the hands of farmers, but only upon leaf tobacco which they may have sold directly to consumers.

2. Under the present law a tax of 6 cents per pound is imposed upon all tobacco stemmed or twisted by a farmer not intended for his own personal use.

3. A farmer may stem and twist tobacco for his own use without incurring liability to tax on such tobacco.

4. Stemming or twisting tobacco is regarded as manufacturing, and a grower or planter can not lawfully stem or twist his tobacco for sale or for the purpose of giving it away without payment of tax. If he should engage in that business, he would be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco and be required to qualify as such by registering with the collector of the district, filing statement and bond, and to pack, label, and stamp his product, as provided by regulations No. 8, pages 5 and 6.

5. "Every person whose business it is to sell or offer for sale manufactured tobacco, snuff, or cigars shall be regarded as a dealer in tobacco."

The grower can stem and twist his growth for his own personal use, but he can not do so to sell. He can not give it to his servant, if he smokes or chews tobacco. He can not give it to his son or to his neighbor as a Christmas gift. He can not give it to the church or charity, unless he pays a 6-cent tax thereon per pound.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. You ought to state also in that connection that every one of these separate twists he fixes up is a separate crime. Down in my neighborhood once there was a deputy United States marshal concluded he would make some money out of this business, and he had one fellow harnessed up with 250 counts in an indictment because he had twisted 250 twists. The whole thing ought to be broken up. It is an outrage.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I presume that was on the ground that one twist was a separate package and a violation of the law in each instance.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman; I am only too glad to get Members interested in this reform. I know my friend from Missouri, as United States district attorney, informed me not long ago that, under oath, he had to prosecute many a farmer for unintentionally violating the law by twisting his tobacco; that he had to prosecute them although he was opposed to the law. My friend from North Carolina knows more about tobacco than I ever knew. I have raised everything on a farm except tobacco.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I want to say that I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee in this matter.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I know that. I have never seen a time when I was right that the gentleman from North Carolina was not delighted to agree with me; and I always agree with him, because he is always right.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not raise tobacco, and I would not raise any if I could. This reform is with me not only a matter of official duty, but personal pleasure. I have at heart the condition of the farmers in my country and of others in the tobacco-growing region.

Take up the Tobacco Leaf, a copy of which I have before me, edited in New York. Read its review this week of the condition of the tobacco growers in the United States. There are but few, if a single State, that the growers are not complaining about the price of leaf tobacco, being from 20 to 30 per cent lower to-day than it was a year ago. Think of those people down in Robertson County, in my district, where in part the illustrious "First Tennessee Regiment" came from—a body of men that President McKinley thought so well of because of their heroism and devotion to duty that he spoke of them praisingly time and time again; and he took nearly all of its officers and appointed them to positions in the United States Army, where they are to-day. Those men acquitted themselves with credit. Yet if they were back there to-day in Robertson County on their farms they could not make a living.

I was told a few days ago by Mr. Hall, the secretary of my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], that he had to go home to take care of the tobacco tenants on his farm, of whom he said, "Not one could pay his tobacco rent this year." Think of that!

Mr. Chairman, I have read to you to show that even hand-stemming or hand-twisting tobacco is, under the law and as construed at the Internal-Revenue Bureau, manufacturing. If, to sell or give away, you stem or twist your own growth of tobacco by the use of your own hands—by the ten fingers that God gave you that you might make a living—without paying a tax, you are violating the law.

Under the law and the decisions of Commissioner Yerkes and his predecessors, changing the tobacco at all from its natural state, except to cure it, is manufacturing. That is the law under the acts of 1894, 1897, and the McKinley tariff, and even before that. Both Democrats and Republicans are responsible for it. We are all responsible for it. We are responsible for it to-day, and will be until we give these people the measure of relief to which they are entitled.

Representatives from twenty-six States of this Union have constituents who grow tobacco.

In 1902 these States raised 821,823,963 pounds; price, 7 cents per pound, or \$57,563,510.

In 1903 they raised 815,972,425 pounds; price, 6.8 cents per pound; value, \$55,514,627, or nearly 6,000,000 pounds less than in 1902, or a loss of about \$2,000,000 to the growers.

The New York Tobacco Leaf of January, 1904, states these facts and prints the following valuable table.

Tobacco crop of 1902 and 1903, by States.

States.	Acreage.		Yield per acre.		Production.		Price per lb.		Total value.	
	1902.	1903.	1902.	1903.	1902.	1903.	1902.	1903.	1902.	1903.
	Acres.	Acres.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Cents.	Cents.	Dollars.	Dollars.
New Hampshire.....	131	132	1,650	1,590	216,150	209,880	16	13.0	38,584	27,284
Vermont.....	191	189	1,800	1,800	343,800	340,200	14	12.0	48,132	40,824
Massachusetts.....	4,755	4,993	1,560	1,400	7,417,800	6,990,200	15	12.0	1,112,670	838,824
Connecticut.....	12,725	13,234	1,712	1,600	21,785,200	21,174,400	16	15.5	3,485,632	3,282,032
New York.....	8,040	7,960	1,250	1,125	10,050,000	8,955,000	8	8.0	804,000	716,400
Pennsylvania.....	17,269	15,887	1,275	1,416	22,017,975	22,496,962	6	7.3	1,321,078	1,642,307
Maryland.....	34,081	33,059	625	650	21,300,625	21,458,350	6	5.5	1,278,038	1,181,559
Virginia.....	182,359	162,300	750	745	136,769,250	120,913,500	7	6.1	8,573,848	7,373,724
North Carolina.....	219,263	214,873	650	627	142,520,950	134,728,506	7	6.3	9,076,466	8,487,896
South Carolina.....	84,912	40,149	734	610	25,625,408	24,490,390	7	5.1	1,793,779	1,249,035
Georgia.....	2,050	2,030	670	640	1,373,500	1,299,200	19	15.0	260,665	194,880
Florida.....	3,079	3,726	520	700	1,601,080	2,608,200	30	32.0	480,324	834,624
Alabama.....	648	629	400	405	259,200	254,745	24	16.0	62,208	40,759
Mississippi.....	175	168	500	502	87,500	84,336	18	16.0	15,750	13,434
Louisiana.....	89	91	375	375	33,375	34,125	20	20.0	6,675	6,825
Texas.....	269	237	650	650	174,850	154,050	22	20.0	38,467	30,819
Arkansas.....	1,405	1,222	640	648	899,200	789,412	12	12.0	107,904	94,729
Tennessee.....	59,830	71,198	650	700	38,889,500	49,838,000	6	7.5	2,323,370	3,737,895
West Virginia.....	4,676	4,335	650	640	2,960,200	2,812,800	7	6.2	207,848	174,204
Kentucky.....	322,194	338,904	800	790	257,755,200	267,280,160	6	6.2	15,465,312	16,570,130
Ohio.....	62,949	60,431	885	845	55,709,865	51,064,195	7	7.2	3,830,691	3,678,622
Michigan.....	302	305	765	750	231,080	228,750	8	8.0	18,482	18,900
Indiana.....	7,469	7,096	835	783	6,236,615	5,553,168	7	6.2	436,593	344,482
Illinois.....	1,311	1,298	650	655	852,150	850,190	7	6.1	59,650	51,862
Wisconsin.....	48,422	51,812	1,340	1,350	64,885,480	69,946,200	7	6.8	4,541,984	4,753,242
Missouri.....	2,140	2,012	850	695	1,819,000	1,404,576	11	9.0	200,090	125,344
United States.....	1,060,734	1,067,735	797.3	786.3	821,823,963	815,972,425	7	6.8	57,563,510	55,514,627

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee allow me one moment?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Tennessee is aware, of course, that the Republican party originally enacted this tobacco tax—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; begun it, sir, in 1862.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Now, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in 1888 the Republican party in the platform adopted in its national convention denounced the tax on tobacco as an annoyance and a burden upon agriculture. Yet that party has never given any relief from this annoyance and burden.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is true. Now I am going to read from the very best authority on this subject to corroborate my friend from North Carolina [Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN], who, as I have said, is always right. I am going to open the RECORD. Mr. Chairman, when the great day comes and the great book is opened, I take it that we shall all be looking around and asking ourselves whether we have done our duty to ourselves, to our neighbors, whom we are directed to love as ourselves, to our fellow-men, and to our country. That will be a great opening.

I am going to open the RECORD and show you what some of the great men of this time and in former years have said on the very subject referred to by my distinguished young friend.

"UNCLE JO" AND TOBACCO-TAX REFORM.

Now, listen while I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Fifty-first Congress, first session, page 4936:

Mr. CANNON. I would like to be heard a few moments upon the subject of tobacco.

Then, when he was allowed to proceed, Mr. CANNON said:

Mr. CANNON. I want to take up now and read that part of the Republican platform of 1888 which was not read by the gentleman on the other side nor my friend from Iowa and which bears directly on this question. I read as follows:

"REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, 1888.

"The Republican party would effect all needed reduction of the national revenues"—

How?—

Says Mr. CANNON—

"by repealing the taxes on tobacco, which are an annoyance and a burden to agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts or for mechanical purposes"—

Now, listen!—

"and by such revision"—

In the conjunctive—

Says Mr. CANNON—

"of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the product of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production, except luxuries, the like of which can not be produced at home."

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, when you read the whole of the platform that it does what? Take the tax off tobacco? Yes. Take the tax off of spirits used in the arts? Yes. Take the tax off of such articles as can not be produced in this country, except luxuries? Yes; and further makes such revision as will keep the home market for the labor of our own country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to preserve the home producer, the tobacco grower as well as the "home market." I want to save

the tobacco grower's home, sweet home, too, as well as the "home market." Then he goes on:

And when you consider all that platform together, you will find this bill follows, in the main, right along that line to keep our home market for our home products, where production is protected and where protection establishes industries of sufficient magnitude substantially to supply our markets and regulate the price of such protected articles wherever produced in our markets.

Now, we take the tax off tobacco and snuff one-half. We take the tax, so far as the licensees are concerned and the vexatious part of it, off entirely. We leave it on cigars.

"Vexatious part"—not "off entirely;" it is still on, hard and fast.

So there is the Republican party committed by its platform, says the present great Speaker of this House, to this reformation, and I dare say the distinguished gentleman of whom I am now speaking thought that Congress had taken all the "vexatious" limitations and all the brutality out of this law, when he was making that very patriotic speech. But not so; vexation has been intensified and in recent report—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask my friend if it is not a fact that the Republican party in two different national platforms pledged itself to the admission of the Territories of Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona to statehood, and if it is not true that that party has repeatedly refused to carry out that promise of its platform, in addition to what you have mentioned?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like to supplement that by stating that I do not believe this is a political question, because, in 1895, when an effort was made to get free alcohol in the line of that suggestion, the Democratic party on your side voted solidly against it, although we had 65 votes on our side for it. Now let us do this as a matter of justice, if it is done at all, and not as a partisan measure.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I can not understand what alcohol has to do with tobacco.

Mr. STANLEY. Is it possible that Kentucky voted to keep the tax on alcohol?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It is not only possible, but a fact.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No, Mr. Chairman, there is no politics in this tobacco question, as I said a while ago. I swept politics out of it when I said and proved both parties were to blame for this law as I see it and that both ought to be ashamed of it.

And I want to say furthermore in defense of Congress that I do not believe Congress knew what it was doing when it passed this law. I do not believe that any Congress in these United States would ever have knowingly imposed this law upon the farmers.

It has slipped and slipped insidiously, as it were, along through the legislation of Congress and been patched and changed until you see what it is.

In addition to that, the rules and regulations that have been made to enforce the law have become so complex that our distinguished Internal-Revenue Commissioners have had to apologize in giving replies to questions as to "what is the law." I do not be-

lieve any Congress would have ever perpetrated such an outrage upon their neighbors and upon themselves.

Now, let me go to another proposition. I have told you already that if you changed the natural tobacco leaf, except to cure it, that is manufacturing; but the farmer can stem and twist for his own personal use. Now let me tell you of another kind of manufacture; that is when the tobacco leaf is not changed at all (except to cure it) and yet is "manufactured," according to the law.

The CHAIRMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I wish somebody would yield me some more time.

Mr. FOSS. I yield to the gentleman—how much time does he desire?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, you see how entertaining I am. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSS. I will yield to the gentleman half an hour.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will take the thirty minutes and yield it back to you if I do not use it.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I shall have to object to any extension of time.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. This is not an extension. The time is yielded by the gentleman from Illinois. I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana if the farmers raise anything but sugar in his State?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. They raise the very best tobacco.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then the gentleman is "in his own light" if he tries to stop me here to-day in discussing the subject of tobacco; and I want to say to the gentleman that he never appears so brilliant as when he is "in his own light."

MANUFACTURED TOBACCO—WHEN NOT CHANGED.

Mr. Chairman, remember my proposition of law, that when tobacco is changed, as I stated to you, it is "manufactured."

Then when it is not changed it is still "manufactured." Now, is there anybody in the Chamber who will dispute that proposition? It is a fact, and I will tell you how it occurs. Mind you, somebody is trying to hobble the tobacco grower, this poor fellow who has to work so hard. I will ask my friend from Kentucky how many months in the year the grower has to work to raise his tobacco crop?

Mr. HOPKINS. Thirteen.

Mr. STANLEY. Thirteen. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Thirteen months in the year. That statement is made on the best of authority, the gentlemen from Kentucky, and I believe it is true. [Laughter.]

Mr. STANLEY. I will state that in a way it is true that it takes thirteen months in a year to raise a crop of tobacco. A man burns his plant bed in February and it is not until March of the following year that the goods can be delivered. I propounded this question to leaf-tobacco dealers and growers who control and sell the majority of tobacco to the export markets of the world and who export from my town alone 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 pounds of tobacco annually, and they estimate that there are actually necessary in raising a crop of tobacco from two hundred to two hundred and fifty days, according to the exigencies governing and prevailing in the season. And those days are of at least fourteen hours long, as the farmer commences in the morning before daylight and does not quit until it is too dark to see how to work.

Mr. SIMS. Thirteen months of fourteen-hour days?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It requires as much attention to attend a crop of tobacco as it does a sick child. The tobacco grower has to get up every morning before or by day and pull the worms, which are large, off the tobacco. [Laughter.] You are not, I dare say, familiar with this kind of "snakes," gentlemen. [Renewed laughter.] The tobacco grower must kill the worm to raise tobacco. He must be an "early bird" to succeed in this industry. Now, I said to you a while ago that when you changed the natural condition of the tobacco it is "manufactured."

But where it is not changed it is also manufactured by the letter of the same law. I will read you that, because that looks like an incorrect statement on its face.

Second paragraph of section 69, act of 1894, amending section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, is as follows:

Every person shall also be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco whose business it is to sell leaf tobacco in quantities less than a hogshead, case, or bale, or who sells directly to consumers, or to persons other than duly registered dealers in leaf tobacco or duly registered manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons who purchase in packages for export; and all tobacco so sold by such persons shall be regarded as manufactured tobacco, and such manufactured tobacco shall be put up and prepared by such manufacturer in such packages only as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe: *Provided*, That farmers and growers of tobacco who sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising shall not be regarded as manufacturers of tobacco; and so much of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and acts amendatory thereof, as are in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

Commenting on this paragraph, Mr. Yerkes says:

In the second paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who sells and delivers his leaf tobacco in its natural condition to consumers, or to persons other than registered dealers in leaf tobacco, manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or persons who buy leaf tobacco in packages for export; and all leaf tobacco so sold by such person is regarded as a manufactured tobacco subject to tax; but there is this exception, that farmers and growers are not to be regarded as manufacturers for selling leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising.

So that every person (except the grower of his own tobacco) is a "manufacturer" if he sells raw leaf to anybody except a registered dealer, a manufacturer, or an exporter, and the natural leaf so sold is manufactured tobacco, and a tax of 6 cents is exacted on the raw leaf! So, you see, if the raw tobacco is not changed and is sold (except by the grower) to anybody on the earth but a registered dealer, a manufacturer, or an exporter, it is manufactured tobacco, subject to this tax, and the person (except farmer) is a manufacturer who makes such a sale. This is an arbitrary restriction on leaf tobacco that should be removed.

So this is another way of hobbling the farmer. When he changes the leaf he must pay 6 cents a pound tax to sell it to any other person, or when any person undertakes to sell the leaf tobacco to consumers he must pay 6 cents a pound because manufactured tobacco, although the natural condition of the tobacco, has not been changed at all!

Now, gentlemen, I know you are all fair, and I do not believe you would knowingly do anything wrong, but when you come in here and endeavor to hobble anybody growing a product, I say to you you can not more completely do so than has been done to tobacco growers by the internal-revenue laws of our country.

The farmer can shell his corn with his ten fingers, as I have done, but he can not take those ten fingers and stem his tobacco or twist it, sitting in the same chair or in the same barn, unless he pays 6 cents a pound tax if he sells or gives it away, and then when he stems it or twists it or changes its natural condition and gives it to anybody, to his son or his family, or to the church or to the presiding elder when he comes around on Sunday to eat dinner with him, he can not even give it to him without committing a crime and subjecting himself to heavy fine and penalty.

ANOTHER BRUTAL LAW.

Again, here is another piece of brutality. If the grower sells tobacco to any person for his own personal consumption and that other person desires afterwards to sell the tobacco, because he does not want it or for any other reason, that other person must first qualify as a registered dealer, and then he can only sell to other dealers, manufacturers, or exporters. I will read a ruling in point:

If the person to whom the farmer sells does not consume the tobacco, but resells it, he must qualify as dealer in leaf tobacco, and then can only sell to other qualified dealers in leaf, to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons for export, as provided in the law and regulations. (Acting Commissioner Wilson in a letter to me, February 11, 1904.)

He can not sell to everybody, so that, Mr. Chairman, we have the tobacco grower's personal liberty vexatiously circumscribed. We find the man himself in his own action is hindered by this law with his own property. We find that his agent is circumscribed in his power of agency; we find the registered dealer's action is circumscribed, and we find that everybody who deals in leaf or natural tobacco, except the tobacco grower himself—and he is circumscribed too, for he can deal only in his own growth without tax—is limited by the law, and hence the tobacco growers are forced to go on and do what?

They have to sell their leaf tobacco to the registered dealer, to the manufacturer, or the exporter to avoid tax, and these three as a rule are all in cahoot to-day behind this great international giant tobacco trust that is bankrupting the growers of tobacco of this country.

Now let me tell you what they are doing down in Kentucky and Tennessee and other parts of the country. This great tobacco trust and these Regie dealers will not compete. They are as one. They will send to buy one man, as they did a few days ago, to a county, or two men or three, and they fix the prices. Several men, but one master and one price! For instance they will come to me and say, "GAINES, I will give you 3½ cents a pound average for your tobacco," and I must take it or hang it up in my barn and carry it for a better day—that does not come—and a good deal of it hangs in the barn to-day, because it costs 6 cents a pound to raise it and the people can not sell it for 3½ cents and live.

What do you find in the counties of Cheatham and Robertson, in Tennessee? Mr. Charles H. Font, Mr. C. P. Warfield, and Mr. Barclay so told us before the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee a few days ago. It has been written of in the Nashville American and Nashville Banner and the Leaf Chronicle of Clarksville, Tenn.; and what did occur in these counties? Why, a grower had a barn of tobacco on one side of the road. He sold it to this agent. "There is another barn of the same tobacco. It is mine," said the grower, "just across the road; I will sell that

at the same price." "Oh, no; this side of the road is as far as I am allowed to go; this road here is my limit; I am not allowed to go over there." This is one of many like cases. So there is no such thing as competition now. There is no competition whatever. The farmer must yield to this one master and one price or put his tobacco in the barn and not sell. Now, what is Congress going to do about it? What is the effect of all this? Last year the Government collected \$43,000,000 internal revenue from tobacco alone.

Mr. STANLEY. From all tobacco?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. From all tobacco.

Mr. STANLEY. What from leaf tobacco?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not remember, but I think we received about \$43,000,000 from "manufactured tobacco." "Manufactured tobacco" is the way it is described in the internal-revenue report.

I do not know how much internal revenue was received from the leaf, but we are going to find out before we get through. I think Mr. Yerkes is trying faithfully to find out, so we will know how much any one of these tobacco bills will reduce the revenue.

Now, gentlemen, what are the tobacco farmers of this country doing? You well know you can not raise anything else profitably on tobacco land but tobacco. It is very drastic to the land also, and you must constantly fertilize it, and the fertilizers are in the hands of the trust, and to buy it and put it on the farm every year practically takes all the profit, even if there were any. Now, what are the farmers doing? They are agreeing and have agreed in Webster County and one of the counties near Guthrie—

Mr. JAMES. Todd County.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Todd County.

Mr. JAMES. And Graves.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. About over the country, and in some portions of Tennessee and some portions of South Carolina, they have agreed not to raise any more tobacco. They are going to boycott the Government. They are going to reduce this \$43,000,000 of revenue. They will not have their liberties outraged in this manner any longer. Now, if this is done, gentlemen, and they raise something else, where are we going to get the \$43,000,000? Again, is it right for us to keep on the statute books such a law as this, striking down in this manner a man's personal liberty, stripping a man of his personal liberty, stripping him from his free agency at every crook and corner of life? It is tax, tax, tax; restrict, restrict, restrict, in the manner I have stated, and the farmers can not stand it any longer.

MINNESOTANS QUIT RAISING TOBACCO.

I have here at my desk an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch that somebody was good enough to send me yesterday, and the substance of that editorial is this: That Minnesota once raised in the southern portion of that great State a magnificent quality of tobacco. But the people up there have quit raising this crop, this paper states. It says they would not stand the restrictions of the internal revenue that is put upon their liberties; that it leaves them without the value of their labor, and robs them of the power of selling by agents and puts them in the hands of the trusts, and they have absolutely abandoned raising tobacco in Minnesota.

Now, I have in my hand a letter received a day or two ago from evidently a good friend of mine, although I have never had the pleasure of personally knowing her, and I will read it to you:

FEBRUARY 14, 1904.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing of the interest you take in agriculture and horticulture, I venture to encroach upon your valuable time by asking you for some garden seeds from the Government, and, if desired, will make report of my success.

Tobacco is "the white man's burden" now, and we farmers' wives are casting about in our minds for some means of helping to keep the wolf from the door, so not a few of us are going to try market gardening, for "where is the man that can live without dining?"

We Tennesseans are watching with interest your pugilistic blows against trusts, and your position on the tobacco question. * * *

Yours, respectfully,

Mrs. G. GILLIS KILLBREW,

R. F. D. No. 5, Guthrie, Ky., or St. Bethlehem, Tenn.

Now, gentlemen, we are going to win in this affair, for you see that the good wives of the farmers of this country are going to help their husbands out, not in raising tobacco—they can not raise it; they can not assist their husbands in that way. They will aid in this boycott.

Why, the negroes and the plain laborers in the South are the men who raise the tobacco, and they are being driven from tobacco fields into the cities, where they become vagrants and burdens on the municipal authorities, or go to the railroads or to the mines, and the result is that the laborer is leaving the farms bankrupt in money and spirit. Now, that is all in the proof we had here the other day. Messrs. Fort, Cunningham, Warfield, and Barclay all said this. They can no longer make a living at this business.

Now, here is another letter of a different nature. I will ask the Clerk to read it aloud, because it is one of the most sensible letters I have received on the subject. It is from Cheatham County, the place where the man went down and bought one barn of tobacco on one side of the road and would not go across and buy the other barn belonging to the same man on the other side of the road because he was limited by that road to a certain district.

The Clerk read as follows:

HARPER, CHEATHAM COUNTY, TENN., Feb. 10, 1904.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We farmers down here are having a hard time. We can not sell our tobacco for anything. We haven't got but two or three buyers to the county. They have their territory laid off; each buyer has to stay in his limit. That is to keep down competition. We haven't got any buyers, only the ones that are buying for the trust. They have cut out all the independent buyers. They come along and price our tobacco; and if the price doesn't suit the farmer, they will just tell him "You will have to sell to us or keep your tobacco; we are the only buyers you will have."

They have got the prices below the cost of production, and the majority of the farmers are in debt and have got to grow tobacco to pay debts. They have spent thousands of dollars preparing to raise tobacco, and now to stop they cannot afford it. We want a market and a free market for our tobacco; we want the trust stopped. It cost the parties that consume the tobacco more money now than it did when they bought from our home buyers. The trust now prices our tobacco and takes it and then prices it to the consumer. We must have something done for us or we will have to do something for ourselves. Please tell us what to do. If the thing goes as it has for the past 3 or 4 years, the people will loose their homes in this part of the world. We have had 4 bad crop years down here. Then the way they are getting our stuff we grow it will ruin us. I no lots of men with good farms, good economizing men, that work hard and stay at home; they are getting in debt and say they will have to sell their homes to pay their debts. That sounds bad for our country. The cotton growers are all O. K. They are getting good prices for cotton, but the tobacco growers are losing out, and I lay it to the tobacco trust. What do you think is the matter?

I no of plenty of men that are so discouraged over the situation that they are moving of and going to the mountains to get out cross ties for 10 cts. a piece. Now, we hate such as this! We ought to have a Government so a hard working, economizing man could have a living. We no there is plenty for all. We farmers haven't got sense sufficient to organize against trust, so the only protection we can look two is our law makers. If your tobacco bill fails to give us relief, we ask you to try to get rid of the trust, and give us a show to make a living. We are willing to do our part, but we are not willing to sacrifice our homes to stuff some trust. Some say quit growing tobacco. The time has come when a man that is in debt cannot quit. We haven't got the money to stock our farms, and before we can get started into any other business we will loose out. It is grow tobacco or work for wages, and any man that owns a farm cannot pay more than 30 or 40 cts. a day for hands to grow tob. What can they do but grow tobacco? We had competition in our markets until 2 or 3 years ago, and we got very reasonable prices, but now we get nothing. Plas do all you can for us and be assured it will be appreciated.

Yours, truly,

RICHARD F. HERRON.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, you see there is that old gentleman whom I have never seen to know, sitting down there writing plain, blunt, terrible facts as the result of the personal liberty of the tobacco grower being curtailed by the law, forcing the grower to sell all his tobacco to the trust.

I ask Congress to turn leaf tobacco completely loose and let the natural tobacco be sold by any person; let them sell it, deal in it, and resell it, as one of the witnesses said the other day:

Give us a chance to take our tobacco from the barn and go to the grocers and trade it for meat and bread, for sugar and coffee, or pay our debts with it—do as we please—and then if the trust won't pay our price we are at liberty to sell it ourselves—in the leaf or hand twist.

As the matter stands now, they can not barter. A man may sell his own tobacco and be untaxed, but if he buys the tobacco of another farmer and undertakes to sell it he is considered under the law a dealer, and when he sells that tobacco he must pay a tax on it.

WHY TAX LEAF TOBACCO?

Why do you want to tax leaf tobacco, anyway? Why do you want to tax a man who, as my friend from Kentucky says, works thirteen months a year to raise tobacco? Why do you not let him use freely his ten fingers and put into the tobacco that he raises all the value that he can? Why do you rob him of the chance to put all the value into that tobacco that God Almighty has given him power to do by the work of his ten fingers? Why do you restrict his liberty?

Why do you tax his produce, and make it possible for the tobacco manufacturer, the tobacco trust, the tobacco millionaires with their machinery, not with fingers, to put all the value they can into the tobacco and sell it back to the grower? There is the "milk in the coconut." Why do you let the farmer change the form of his corn as he pleases, put all the value in it that he can and not tax him? It is because he is a producer; he is a man who creates something. The manufacturer is a man who absorbs something another creates. In this instance the laws are so arranged and are so enforced as that the manufacturer practically robs the tobacco grower of a large part of his profit—the fruits of his labor—and appropriates them under the law. There is no other agricultural produce that is taxed in this way.

I grant you that taking tobacco and turning it into snuff is manufacturing, because in that case you make a new article. But tobacco is still tobacco, though the stems be pulled out or twisted. In addition to that, tobacco thus raised and thus

stemmed and twisted by the farmer is pure tobacco. The tobacco after it is manufactured is, 40 per cent of it, "doctored." The laborers in the South, the negroes who may work in the cotton field (where they do not raise tobacco), or the laborers in the woods or in the fields, whether white or black, prefer the pure tobacco, the country twist, to the manufactured "doctored" stuff, for which they have to pay 40 or 50 cents a pound, when they can buy pure tobacco, home twist, for 20 cents or less.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the leader of the minority in this House, attended a meeting of the subcommittee a few days ago and while there said that in Mississippi, where they do not raise tobacco, they would be very glad to get tobacco in the leaf and do their own twisting—hang it in the loft, as I have seen it done in days gone by when I was a farmer boy in the country. I see that no more.

Now the farmer must deliver his tobacco in person. In many cases if he did that he could not be with his family. Some member of the family may be sick. Hence the farmer is unable to "drum" or deliver his tobacco in person. He can not leave home.

Now, why not give him the right to deliver that tobacco by his agent; to put his boy in the wagon, just as he would send him to mill with corn, as we have, many of us, done? Let him, as my friend from Mississippi suggested the other day, put his tobacco in his wagon in the twist, so that it will not break all to pieces or crumble on the way. Let that tobacco be sent in a wagon to Mississippi or any of the nontobacco-producing parts of the country. Let the farmer send his tobacco by an agent to some agent, giving the agent authority to sell it, as if he were himself the grower. At present the agent has not that authority under the law. The solicitor can only solicit orders; he can not deliver. The registered dealer can sell, but can only sell to dealers, manufacturers, and exporters.

Now, I appeal to this House to give the tobacco grower freedom of action. Restore his right of free agency; give him the power to authorize his agent to do everything that the grower ought to be allowed to do himself. Take the tax off the leaf tobacco when it is sold to anybody or by anybody. Let the grower stem and twist his own growth and sell it free of tax. Under present circumstances it is treated as manufactured tobacco if anybody sells it but the farmer himself. Why do you want to tax tobacco in that way? Why do you want to put that kink in the law unless to fasten the control of the tobacco market in the hands of the tobacco manipulator? [Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman half an hour more if he desires it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I thank my friend very much.

Now, look at the brutality of that provision. Look at the "nigger in the wood pile," if you please. Look at the "kernel" of this thing. If changing tobacco from its natural condition is manufacturing it, how, in the name of Heaven, can Congress truthfully say that when it is not changed it is manufactured? It is a legislative lie. It is not manufactured unless it is changed. The word "manufactured" itself means changed, and when it is not changed I say it is not manufactured. But you say it is manufactured if any person but the farmer sells it, and if his purchaser sells it to any other person than a registered dealer or manufacturer or an exporter he is taxed.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I should like to know whether the gentleman has a bill pending before any committee of the House—and if so, before what committee is it pending—to remove these obnoxious taxes?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have had a bill pending in the last Congress and one in this Congress, and there are four others that propose to give this relief, and we have had a very considerate, fair hearing, so far, before the subcommittee, presided over by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and I am satisfied that we interested the committee very much, because they verified every statement I made, and this vexatious law was reviewed. The committee did not know what the law was, of course. We are finding out what the law is now. By the assistance of the Internal-Revenue Bureau, by the assistance of everybody that I can get to help me, by employing much of my time daily ever since Congress met, I have finally reached down to where I find that the law is exactly as I have stated it to-day.

We are going to have another hearing next week. We are going to have Mr. Commissioner Yerkes down to tell us how much revenue it will relieve the Treasury of. It may reduce it, but I do not believe it will. But if you do not relieve the tobacco growers, I have already shown you that the tobacco growers of this country are going to quit growing it and are going to raise something else.

Mr. JAMES. That would curtail the revenue.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It certainly would reduce the amount of revenue now received, which was last year \$43,000,000

from tobacco. What the growers want is free trade in leaf tobacco in the hands of any person and the right to stem and twist their own growth and sell it without tax. Let them sell it without agents and with agents. Let them send it by express, by telegraph, by telephone, by boat, wagon, automobile, or air ship, or any other way, anywhere. Liberty of action is what they want. Let these growers know once more at least, by what you shall do for them in this matter, that they are sons of freemen and are freemen.

A VEXATIOUS LIMITATION.

I hear it said that there is no tax on leaf tobacco in the hands of the grower. It is true the grower pays no tax on his leaf, but there is a tax on that same leaf if sold by any other person than the grower if sold to a consumer. Why this limitation? Leaf tobacco is leaf in anyone's hands, and a purchaser ought not to be required to pay a tax if he sells it to a consumer. This forces him to sell directly or indirectly to the tobacco trust. Let everybody without any restriction trade in leaf.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. In other words, let everybody sell to the consumer.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; when any person except the grower sells to the consumer it is manufactured tobacco and subject to tax. I am satisfied that little or no revenue comes from this limitation, but this limitation is such a restriction as to tax the leaf tobacco and prevent it from being more generally sold and consumed by the great masses of the people, and in effect taxes or burdens the grower by reducing the price of his growth. I know of no one who is engaged in the business of selling leaf tobacco to consumers, but if there is such a person, the tobacco he sells is subject to a tax. To remove this limitation would not reduce the revenues very much, if any. Our revenues come mostly from the manufactured product; in fact, I have been unable to find in any report of recent years where any tax was paid on leaf tobacco sold by anyone. There is no one engaged in the business of "selling leaf to consumers" but the farmer who pays no tax. But this little kink in the law unreasonably, unnecessarily, limits the trade in leaf tobacco without producing any revenue, and should be repealed.

TOBACCO GROWERS AGREEING TO QUIT RAISING TOBACCO.

I will read here the report of a meeting of the Webster County, Ky., tobacco growers, wherein they are reported to have prepared a resolution calling on the farmers not to raise any tobacco next year:

TOBACCO GROWERS OF WEBSTER COUNTY, KY., MEET AND DECIDE TO ABANDON THE PRODUCTION OF A TOBACCO CROP THE PRESENT YEAR—ARTICLE SIGNED.

At a meeting of tobacco growers recently held in Webster County, Ky., fully 80 per cent of the represented acreage decided to abandon the production of the crop in 1904, says the Henderson Gleaner. While some are and always will be dependent on tobacco as long as the cropping system continues in vogue, the majority of growers can readily control the production if they will, and they now seem determined to do so.

The following is a brief summary of the article adopted, and it is requested that growers in other localities in the strip district communicate with each other and with the leaders in this movement, tending toward a rapid extension and decided expression of the idea.

RESOLUTION.

"We, the undersigned tobacco growers, do hereby agree to abandon the production of this crop, either personally or by croppers and renters, during the year 1904. Provided, That 75 per cent of the growers in the export type of tobacco sign this or some other similar agreement before March 1, 1904."

It is proposed to work out further details later.

A number of counties have done that.

Now, gentlemen, let us consider the question of revenue.

REVENUE CONSIDERED.

Mr. JAMES. The purpose of this law of yours would be to let the tobacco users of the United States become competitors of the trust in the purchase of the tobacco of the farmer?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Exactly. If you will turn the farmers loose who grow the tobacco, they will wipe out the trust. Take all restrictions and taxes from the leaf.

Mr. JAMES. That would either force the trust to give them better prices or let them find some other purchaser?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Exactly. As it is, the trust "holds up" the grower and his product, too, because of these limitations on both.

Mr. BURLESON. Why is it that these absurd, oppressive, and tyrannical laws with reference to the growing and sale of tobacco are not repealed?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will say to my friend as seriously and candidly as he has asked this question that I think that some smart lawyer representing the tobacco trust, who could use language far-reaching in practical effect, wrote the law, and that Congress did not know what it was doing when it passed these severe laws, and so these limitations were fastened in the law, which hobble the grower in the sale of his product. I do not believe that any Congress with a conscience would have been knowingly guilty of passing such savage, tyrannical laws as these. The tax on tobacco, as I have already stated, begun in 1862.

Some of the act of July 20, 1868, is now the law. It has been added to, however, from time to time, down to 1892.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, so that there may not be any misapprehension, is the law which you wish to modify the original law which you referred to in the opening of your remarks, the statute of 1862?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The laws of which the growers most complain have been enacted in recent years. They are pointed out by Commissioner Yerkes as being the acts of August 28, 1894, section 69, and section 3 of the act of April 12, 1902. These acts are all based on and are amendments to a string of internal-revenue laws which run back to each and every year to the act of June 20, 1868, which repealed several acts passed between the original act of July 1, 1862, and June 20, 1868. It may be to give the desired relief that not only the recent enactments but the parent act must be modified. The farmers, however, have managed to live and let live until the enactments of April 12, 1902, and August 28, 1894. They complain of restrictions that both Commissioner Yerkes and myself find incorporated in these two acts. Conditions during that period of time have become intolerable to the grower of tobacco. These two acts, it seems, coupled with the rules and regulations made to enforce them, is the evil. I am advised by the correspondence that I have from the internal-revenue department and my investigation of the law. Indeed, the act of April 12, 1902, reenacts a part of the old act of 1868, Mr. Yerkes informs me in his letter of April 12, 1902.

Mr. BOUTELL. In order that we may have no misunderstanding about it, because it is a matter of very great interest to a large number of people, is the law of which the gentleman from Tennessee now complains the original law of 1862, or is it some recent amendment of that law?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The act of July 1, 1862, established our internal-revenue system of that date. Twist tobacco was taxed under that law. I want now to untax it when the grower twists it of his own growth and desires to sell it or give it away. I do not know whether that act taxed hand-twist or machine-twist tobacco. But the law of to-day taxes twisted tobacco whether twisted by machine or hand. And it seems that the act of April 12, 1902, and the act of August 28, 1894, has made this change and many other objectionable changes by way of amending the former law. The law of June 20, 1868, is in part the law of to-day. It repealed all former conflicting laws. The act of April 12, 1902, Commissioner Yerkes says, restored a part of the old act of 1868, found in the Revised Statutes of 1873, section 3368. If you will read his letter to me of March 12, 1903, in my former speech, you will be thoroughly informed on this point. I will read that letter in part if I have time.

Mr. BOUTELL. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee would it not have placed this matter to better effect, if it is in fact a law of 1862, to state that with perfect frankness, rather than that it is a law conceived by some skillful attorney of the trust, the tobacco trust being of very modern origin.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But only in the last few years have these intolerable burdens and denials by operation of law been felt by the farmers, and Mr. Yerkes, in his letter to me March 12, 1903, states that section 3 of April 12, 1902, is only reenactment of section 3367 of the Revised Statutes of 1873, the act of July 20, 1868, section 61. It seems the farmers complain more of the Wilson than of the McKinley Act, but that they complain more since the act of April 12, 1902, than ever heretofore.

Mr. STANLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, as I understand the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee it is that this law was enacted for one purpose and that its operation has secured an entirely different result. That is especially plain of the act of 1894, making an artificial definition of manufactured tobacco, namely, that any tobacco, whether in the natural leaf or otherwise, not consumed by the producer of it was manufactured tobacco, with certain immaterial conditions provided if sold by anyone but the producer, who can only sell free of tax his own growth.

Mr. BOUTELL. With the permission of the gentleman from Tennessee I would like to ask the gentleman who has last spoken whether it is his belief that the tobacco trust could have anything to do with the control of the legislation of 1894?

Mr. STANLEY. I am not trying to go into politics. I am not saying that any particular trust did this. But if the gentleman will pardon me just a minute, it is very plain that the intent of the lawmakers in passing that law was to prevent the leaf, which was untaxed in the hands of the farmer, from being manufactured without the Government having an eye to it. That was plainly the purpose of the law. Now, the operation of the law has been to restrict the farmer in the sale of his leaf tobacco to nobody except a licensed dealer, because it can be sold only to a licensed dealer by the agent of the farmer. In that way it has placed the article where it can be controlled by great aggregations of capital, and is not producing a dime of revenue.

After examining this law and after having seen from my own personal experience that the operation of the law was to prevent the farmer from selling natural leaf unstemmed any way to anybody but the licensed dealer, I wrote to Commissioner Yerkes, asking him if prior to the enactment of the law of 1894 there was any effort on the part of the manufacturers of tobacco to evade the law—and it is only a 6-cent duty, nothing like the duty in the foreign countries from which this provision was copied—and he said there had been, to his knowledge, absolutely no fraud on the part of the farmers or persons purchasing from the farmers this leaf tobacco and using it in that state. There was no necessity for the law, and the operation of the law was directly in the interest of the large consumers by putting all the leaf tobacco in the class of manufactured tobacco.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But Commissioner Yerkes shows, in his letter to me of March 12, 1903, that the laws of which the growers complain were passed in 1894 and 1902, which are amendatory. In answering my questions he cites the acts of April 12, 1902, section 3, and August 28, 1894, section 69. He says:

Without attempting to give you an immediate categorical answer to each question as presented, I have the honor to inform you that at the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, by act approved April 12, 1902, section 3, the following law was passed relating to tobacco:

"SEC. 3. That upon tobacco and snuff manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, there shall be levied and collected, in lieu of the tax now imposed by law, the following taxes:

"On snuff, manufactured of tobacco or any substitute for tobacco, ground, dry, damp, pickled, scented, or otherwise, of all descriptions, when prepared for use, a tax of 6 cents per pound. And snuff flour, when sold, or removed for use or consumption, shall be taxed as snuff, and shall be put up in packages and stamped in the same manner as snuff.

"On all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine cut, cavendish, plug, or twist, cut or granulated, of every description; on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed, or in any manner other than the ordinary mode of drying and curing, prepared for sale or consumption, even if prepared without the use of any machine or instrument, and without being pressed or sweetened; and on all fine-cut shorts and refuse scraps, clippings, cuttings, and sweepings of tobacco, a tax of 6 cents per pound."

You will not find in this section any exemption in favor of the farmer, who is not privileged to twist, stem, or otherwise change his tobacco and prepare it for consumption.

This section is only a reenactment of section 3368 of the Revised Statutes of 1873, act of July 20, 1868, section 61, and which last act first imposed a stamp tax on tobacco.

This provision of law has been in force continuously, without change except as to the rate of tax, since 1868.

Proceeding with his letter to me, Mr. Commissioner Yerkes says:

Section 3362 of the Revised Statutes and amendatory acts require that all manufactured tobacco and snuff shall be prepared and put up by the manufacturer thereof in certain specified packages and in no other manner before removal for sale or consumption, and provides that all cavendish, plug, and twist tobacco shall be put up in certain packages, and smoking tobacco and all cut and granulated tobacco in certain other packages; and this section makes no exemption in favor of the farmer or grower of tobacco.

"MANUFACTURER" DEFINED.

The Commissioner's letter continues:

The definition of a "manufacturer of tobacco" will be found in subsection 9 of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 69, act of August 28, 1894.

Said section 69 provides that—

"Every person whose business it is to manufacture tobacco or snuff for himself, or who employs others to manufacture tobacco or snuff, whether such manufacture be by cutting, pressing, grinding, crushing, or rubbing of any raw or leaf tobacco, or otherwise preparing raw or leaf tobacco, or manufactured or partially manufactured tobacco or snuff, or the putting up for use or consumption of scraps, waste, clippings, stems, or deposits of tobacco resulting from any process of handling tobacco, or by the working or preparation of leaf tobacco, tobacco stems, scraps, clippings, or waste, by sifting, twisting, screening, or any other process, shall be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco."

In construing this language the Commissioner says:

In the first—

That is the language just read—

paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who in any manner prepares his leaf tobacco for consumption by crushing, twisting, stemming, grinding, or otherwise changing the tobacco from its natural condition.

By this paragraph of this section 69 "every person" is classed and taxed as a manufacturer of tobacco who "prepares his leaf tobacco for consumption by changing the tobacco from its natural condition."

Commissioner Yerkes continues:

The second paragraph of that section (69) provides that—

"Every person shall also be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco whose business it is to sell leaf tobacco in quantities less than a hoghead, case, or bale, or who sells directly to consumers, or to persons other than duly registered dealers in leaf tobacco or duly registered manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons who purchase in packages for export; and all tobacco so sold by such persons shall be regarded as manufactured tobacco, and such manufactured tobacco shall be put up and prepared by such manufacturer in such packages only as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe: *Provided*, That farmers and growers of tobacco who sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising shall not be regarded as manufacturers of tobacco; and so much of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and acts amendatory thereof, as are in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

The Commissioner, in construing this paragraph, says:

In the second paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who sells and delivers leaf tobacco in its natural condition to consumers, or to persons other than registered dealers in leaf tobacco, manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or persons who buy leaf tobacco in packages for export; and all leaf tobacco so sold by such person is regarded as a manufactured tobacco subject to tax; but there is this exception, that farmers and growers are not to be regarded as manufacturers for selling leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising.

AN ABLE COMMISSIONER'S APOLOGY.

The difficulty in the way of a lucid interpretation of the statutes relating to the sale of leaf tobacco by farmers has been that such restrictions have been coupled with special tax provisions and not contained in any separate statutes.

I have already read the first provision that appeared in this House, so far as I have been able to find, which undertook to tax leaf or stem tobacco. But the House struck out this clause entirely, because it was taxing unmanufactured tobacco, and transferred the tax to the next clause, taxing manufactured tobacco. This was March 28, 1862.

Mr. STANLEY. What year?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. March 28, 1862. I will read again the clause which was then stricken out of the bill:

On tobacco, leaf or stem, unmanufactured, 3 cents per pound, and a payment of this duty shall not exempt tobacco from a further duty when manufactured.

Thus Congress, indeed the committee that reported the bill to the House, not only refused to tax leaf or stem, but classified leaf and stem as unmanufactured tobacco and not subject to a tax unless manufactured. Now, in time of peace, unless the tobacco grower sells the leaf of his own raising, it is taxed, if sold to consumers. If any other person sells it to a consumer it is taxed as manufactured tobacco and the person selling is declared a manufacturer. Stemmed tobacco is manufactured, under the present law, and stemming is manufacturing; but the farmer can stem and twist for his personal use.

Commissioner Yerkes, in his very valuable opinion incorporated in his letter to me, found in my former speech, reviews many laws and parts of laws from June 20 down to the act of April 12, 1902.

We know that the McKinley Act changed the law; that the Wilson Act changed the McKinley Act; that the Dingley Act changed the Wilson Act, but left, I believe, the objectionable definition made by the Wilson Act of the words "manufacturer" and "manufacturing," whereby every person is made a manufacturer who sells leaf tobacco to a consumer, except the grower in the sale of his own growth and raising. We know that Commissioner Yerkes in his letter to me states that the act of April 12, 1902, section 3, reenacts section 3368 of the Revised Statutes of 1863, act of July 20, 1863, section 61. He also stated that it is very difficult to give "a lucid interpretation of the statutes relating to the sale of leaf tobacco by the farmer" because of restrictions in special statutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I regret I have not heard all the gentleman's speech, because this is a matter in which I am very much interested; that is of interest to my State. Will the gentleman kindly read what he characterizes as the objectionable section?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will refer my friend to the letter containing the objectionable laws, written me by Commissioner Yerkes, found in my speech of December 14, 1903. He will there see that the Commissioner reviews a great many statutes and amendments thereto and gives the history with particularities, and as I have already read the objectionable laws as set forth in his letter, I will ask my friend to be content with the construction placed upon those laws by Commissioner Yerkes. The construction is very plainly worded by the Commissioner, while the laws are very abstruse and hard for anyone to understand, even after hours and months of hard study. The Commissioner himself says they are hard to elucidate. As I understand his letter, he concludes that the act of August 28, 1894, section 69, amending former laws, and the later act of April 12, 1902, reenacting and possibly amending still older laws—the act of 1863—are the objectionable and oppressive laws of which the growers now complain.

ACT OF APRIL 12, 1902.

Of the act of April 12, 1902, the Commissioner says:

You will not find in this section any exemption in favor of the farmer, who is not privileged to twist, stem, or otherwise change his tobacco and prepare it for consumption.

This section is only a reenactment of section 3368 of the Revised Statutes of 1873, act of July 20, 1863, section 61, and which last act first imposed a stamp tax on tobacco.

This provision of law has been in force continuously, without change, except as to the rate of tax, since 1863.

Immediately in this connection the Commissioner says:

Section 3362 of the Revised Statutes, and amendatory acts, require that all manufactured tobacco and snuff shall be prepared and put up by the manufacturer thereof in certain specified packages and in no other manner before removal for sale or consumption, and provides that all cavendish, plug, and twist tobacco shall be put up in certain packages, and smoking tobacco and all cut and granulated tobacco in certain other packages; and this section makes no exemption in favor of the farmer or grower of tobacco.

ACT OF AUGUST 28, 1894.

The Commissioner says the definition of manufactured tobacco is found in subsection 9 of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 69, act of August 28, 1894. Said section 69 provides that—he then quotes this section, which I will insert a little later.

He then says the second paragraph of that section provides that—he inserts that, which I will do.

Now, then, here is the construction which the Commissioner gives of this section 69, which he quoted. He says:

In the first paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who in any manner prepares his leaf tobacco for consumption by crushing, twisting, stemming, grinding, or otherwise changing the tobacco from its natural condition.

In the second paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who sells and delivers his leaf tobacco in its natural condition to consumers, or to persons other than registered dealers in leaf tobacco, manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or persons who buy leaf tobacco in packages for export; and all leaf tobacco so sold by such person is regarded as a manufactured tobacco subject to tax; but there is this exception, that farmers and growers are not to be regarded as manufacturers for selling leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising.

If you talk to the growers of tobacco, they will tell you that the trouble of which they complain has arisen "in the last year or two." Others will say it was the "act of August 20, 1894, that caused the trouble." This corroborates the opinion of Commissioner Yerkes, who, as we see, says that the laws of to-day that are objectionable are the acts of 1894 and 1902. So that both Democrats and Republicans, gentlemen, are to blame for this obnoxious, vexatious, brutal legislation, and they both should unite at once and remove the evil. I have already explained the practical operation of the law as complained of by the tobacco growers, but as the gentleman from Wisconsin has asked for information I will briefly repeat what Mr. Yerkes says the trouble is.

Mr. Yerkes says to change the natural condition in any way, except to cure it, is manufacturing, and no one is allowed to do that, without paying a tax of 6 cents, except the grower; but if the grower changes the natural condition and gives it away or sells it he has to pay a tax of 6 cents a pound. It costs 6 cents now to raise it in Tennessee, and it is now selling on an average of 3½ cents. The grower can not give it to his family or give it to his church or to anybody. He can not give it to charity.

MANUFACTURED WHEN NOT CHANGED.

So if the farmer sells his own growth of leaf tobacco he is not a manufacturer of leaf tobacco, and the leaf tobacco is not manufactured. But if any other person sells this same tobacco to consumers or any person other than to dealers, manufacturers, and exporters, the leaf tobacco is manufactured, although it is not changed from its natural condition, except cured.

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a moment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Suppose the farmer stems it, can he get more money from it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; because the grower puts more labor in his tobacco when he stems or twists it. But let me say that he can not do that for sale or gift unless he pays the 6-cent tax. The manufacturer puts all that value into it and sells it back to the farmer for from 20 to 40 cents a pound.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What makes it bring less is that the stems weigh something?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That may be one reason. Now stems are used, while formerly they were thrown away. But another reason is that you put more labor into the stemmed tobacco, and the more labor you put into a thing the more valuable it is—presumptuously, at least. Then another reason is that it is less bulky and is easier handled. The grower can handle it better in the twist. It won't shatter and lose away in that fix. It can be hauled in a wagon that way and not crumble.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Are the stems marketable?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes, even exported—

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. I would like to state to the gentleman that these stems are now manufactured into what is called "sheepwash," but that name is a delusion, and is only for the purpose of deceiving persons as to the real purpose of the product. It bears the same relation to the stems that attar of roses does to the roses. It takes tons to make a small quantity. The extract looks like thick molasses, and is exported to Germany, where our tobacco was formerly shipped.

There is a German tobacco that is grown there which has the qualities of a sponge. The leaf is very much like our mullein leaf in this country, with a bitter taste. It looks like tobacco, but has very little taste of tobacco. It has a spongy leaf and absorbs this extract. In that way they are doing away with the necessity of importing American tobacco and paying the duty on

it. These sellers are actually now buying the American product at 2½ cents a pound, taking the American leaf with the stem, making it into sheepwash, shipping it to Germany, and making tobacco again.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, let me give you a definition of a manufacturer by the Supreme Court of the United States. You will find that in my speech of December 14 last. The truth is that you can find almost everything that is good on this subject in my speech. [Laughter.]

I read from the case of *Hartman v. Weigman* (121 U. S.). The court was passing on the question, Are shells "manufactured" or "unmanufactured" that had been cleaned by acids and intended to be sold as shells?

The court says:

We are of opinion that the shells in question here were not manufactured, and were not manufactures of shells, within the sense of the statute imposing a duty of 35 per cent upon such manufactures, but were shells unmanufactured.

They were still shells. They have not been manufactured into a new and different article, having a distinctive name, character, or use from that of a shell.

The application of labor to an article, either by hand or by mechanism, does not make the article necessarily a manufactured article, within the meaning of that term as used in the tariff laws.

Washing and scouring wool does not necessarily make that resulting wool a manufacture of wool; cleaning and ginning cotton does not make the resulting cotton a manufacture. (121 U. S., 614.)

Pressed or baled hay is not manufactured (20 Blatch., supra); a publisher of a newspaper is not a manufacturer. (In re Capital Publishing Co., 3 McArthur, 412; in re Kenyon, 1 Utah, 47.)

Marble cut into blocks for convenient transportation is not manufactured. (121 U. S., supra.)

This definition is followed in 50 Federal Reports, page 71.

Now, gentleman, I want to say to my good and sensible and able friend from Wisconsin that the Supreme Court held way back in 2 Cranch, Chief Justice Marshall speaking for the court, that imported copperplates with "raised edges" were raw copper, not manufactured; that this was the "policy" of Congress then. But now the least "change" in the natural condition of tobacco (except to cure) makes it manufactured and it is manufactured when not changed, if sold to consumers, except by the grower from his own raising.

Now, just think of that proposition!

I hold in my hand a letter from my old lawyer friend, John M. Foster, Robertson County, Tenn. He has now gone to the country to engage in farming. He writes as follows:

CEDAR HILL, TENN., December 14, 1903.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GAINES: * * * Could not a law be passed to give the growers the power, not to manufacture, but simply to sell their crude leaf to any and all persons and in any quantity merely without supervision or the payment of any tax whatever? That would free us from the licensed dealers, and we could sell our crops ourselves or through our agents. An old gentleman in my neighborhood was compelled to sell at home to a licensed dealer or buyer for 8 cents for his first and second class and 2 cents for his lugs. He had two sons living in Arkansas, and shipped the boys 50 pounds for them to chew and smoke. These boys could have sold every pound for 50 cents per pound, while their father was compelled to take for his crop, as farmers divide it, that is, first and second class, 8 cents per pound, and 2 cents for third class, or lugs.

Mr. Foster says that these two sons in Arkansas, to whom the father had sent his tobacco in the leaf, could have sold it for 50 cents per pound if they had been allowed by the law to do so, while the old father at home sold the balance of the crop for 8 cents for his first and second class and 2 cents for his lugs.

For these sons to have sold this tobacco, this gift, they would have been compelled to qualify as manufacturers and pay 6 cents per pound if they sold to consumers, and the reason why the father practically gave his tobacco away at 8 and 2 cents, when it cost him 6 cents to raise it, was because there is no competition in buying, the tobacco trust being the only purchaser.

They raise little tobacco in Arkansas and many other States. They all raise more or less. Laborers, black and white, prefer the homespun leaf or twist, because it is cheap and pure and can ordinarily be bought at 15 and 20 cents per pound, according to locality. In nonproducing communities it is higher, otherwise lower. The manufactured tobacco sells at 20, 40, and 50 cents per pound. It is not pure tobacco. It is "doctored" with liquor, molasses, sugar, taffy, and heaven knows what else, and inhabited with a few microbes, the bacteriologists will tell you.

I would say to my friend from Wisconsin that there is free trade in tobacco, wheat, and all other agricultural products, but there is no free trade in leaf tobacco. The grower can sell his own crop to anybody anywhere free of tax, but he can not buy other crops and sell free of tax and other limitations, and when any person except the grower sells leaf to a consumer he pays a tax.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Tennessee kindly state the reasons the advocates of the existing law have assigned for its retention?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. "Will it reduce the revenues?" is the question they are now considering. But I can not believe that even if it will reduce the revenue the law, when fully under-

stood, will be continued in its entirety. When my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the chairman of the subcommittee now considering my bill and others, and his able lieutenants, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who with my able friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] are giving me such close attention to-day, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COOPER]—all good lawyers—

Mr. STANLEY. And the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes. When these gentlemen fully understand the terrible and far-reaching effect of these laws, I do not believe that they will consider the question of revenues as the sole question to decide what they should do. I believe that they will give relief, at least some of the relief, we ask, regardless of the revenue feature.

QUESTION OF REVENUE.

So far as the question of revenue is concerned, I want to show you that there is no revenue, or practically none, derived from the sale of leaf tobacco. The farmer can sell his own growth in raising without any tax whatever, and any other person can sell leaf tobacco without tax unless he sells it to a consumer, and I do not believe that there are any persons (except the grower) who sell the leaf tobacco to consumers, and therefore there can be no tax on sales made by such persons to consumers, and to give free trade in leaf tobacco in the hands of any and every person would not cut off the revenue, because there are no persons selling leaf tobacco to consumers except the grower, who is not taxed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope I may be allowed two or three minutes more.

Mr. FOSS. I give the gentleman from Tennessee five minutes more.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have read closely the last report of the internal revenue. I can not find where any person (except the grower) has sold leaf tobacco to consumers. I do not believe there are any persons engaged in selling leaf tobacco to consumers. If there are any such persons, then they pay 6 cents per pound tax. There being no such persons or business, there can be no tax paid to the Government by any such persons in any such business. The tobacco was sold by the grower to exporters, to dealers, to manufacturers. The dealers and manufacturers are represented or controlled directly or indirectly by the tobacco trust. They manufacture tobacco. When it is manufactured, they pay a tax of 6 cents. That is where we got the \$43,000,000 revenue last year. Hence, to repeal that law that says "any person but the grower that sells tobacco to consumers" would not curtail the revenues.

HAND STEM OR HAND TWIST.

To change the law and give the grower the right to hand stem or hand twist his own growth and raising, and none other, would increase the rights and privileges of the grower, restore his liberty, and arm him with the power to say to the tobacco trust: "You must pay my price for my tobacco or I will hand stem it and hand twist it and sell it myself." In this way the tobacco grower could terrorize and compete with the tobacco trust. However, I do not believe that a grower could compete very successfully (but with some success you must all grant) with the tobacco trust, which uses machinery to stem and twist, while the grower would use his fingers and not machinery. The hand manufacturer of anything can not very well compete with the machine manufacturer, but to give this relief would give the grower some leverage to compete with the trust. The grower could sell at least to that class of people who want the pure natural tobacco and who would buy that for that reason alone against buying the medicated manufactured tobacco, which some dislike.

EXPORT TOBACCO.

We export millions and millions of raw and manufactured tobacco annually and receive not a cent of revenue therefrom. Our domestic exports of unmanufactured tobacco during the year 1902 were as follows:

	Pounds.	Value.
Leaf	353,317,885	\$34,303,294
Stems and trimmings	10,751,955	247,221
Total	364,069,840	\$4,640,515

We exported in 1903 manufactured domestic tobacco as follows:

Cigarettes	1,458,452
Cigars	1,908,000
Pipe	7,338,640 pounds
All other manufactured	1,182,150

Here, then, we have 372,588,130 pounds of tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, and 1,660,000,000 cigars and cigarettes exported which do not furnish one cent of revenue to the Government.

Gentlemen, you will remember that from 1868 to 1883 Congress levied a tax, an export stamp tax, on tobacco exported. The stamp was to be affixed before the tobacco was removed for export. Most of the time the rate was 30 cents, the balance 10 cents. Repealed in 1883. It was held valid in two separate and distinct opinions by the Supreme Court of the United States—in *Pace v. Burgess* (92 U.S., 372), and again in 117 United States Reports, page 534. The opinions were unanimous, Mr. Justice Bradley speaking for the court in both cases. Justice Bradley, in writing the opinion, said it was a valid police law because it prevented frauds. It prevented a man from saying he was going to export tobacco when he did not really intend to do so, and did not do so. When a man says he is going to export his tobacco, you have only his word for it. This tax paid for policing the tobacco out of the United States to foreign countries.

Mr. Commissioner Yerkes informs me that there is no tax levied on exported tobacco. Hence the Government must now pay for policing this tobacco out of the United States into foreign countries. If to give the tobacco growers the relief they ask reduces our revenues too much, you can easily restore this stamp tax on exported manufactured tobacco and more than reimburse the Government. A mere shadow of a tax on this immense export of manufactured tobacco would more than cover the little pittance of revenue that the Government might lose and restore to the farmers their personal liberty and raise the heavy hand of the law that now oppresses them in the manipulation of their tobacco.

At all events, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of humanity, for the sake of the tobacco farmer—good citizens they are in every State of the Union—for the sake of their wives and children, give the tobacco growers a chance to save their little homes from the auction block. Save the industry of tobacco growing. The use of tobacco may be a luxury, but raising it is a burden. The tobacco growers are sturdy citizens, and the tobacco-growing industry has helped to save us in time of war and in time of peace. Tobacco revenues are constant. This industry gives employment to millions of our good citizens, black and white alike, living in mansions and log cabins throughout our fair land. Make them free men and their industry free. Let them know and feel the Government is their friend and not their oppressor into bankruptcy and commercial death. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

MR. YERKES'S LETTER.

WASHINGTON, March 12, 1903.

Hon JOHN W. GAINES,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives.

SIR: I have received your letters, dated 7th and 9th instant, respectively, presenting the following questions:

1. You ask, Did the Fifty-sixth or Fifty-seventh Congress relieve tobacco growers of taxes on tobacco raised by them; and if so, under what statute and section thereof?

2. Does the law tax—and if so, how much—tobacco growers when they stem or twist their tobacco for their own use or to sell the same?

3. Can tobacco growers stem or twist their tobacco for their own personal use without paying a tax?

4. Can tobacco growers stem or twist their tobacco for the purpose of giving it away without paying a tax?

5. You ask for the departmental or judicial definition of the term "dealer in tobacco."

6. You ask for the definition of the term "manufacturer of tobacco."

7. You ask whether a tobacco grower who stems or twists his tobacco grown on his own farm or purchased from a neighbor is a manufacturer, or, in other words, whether stemming or twisting tobacco is manufacturing.

In conclusion, you ask if there is in existence any law which requires a farmer who raises tobacco to pay any tax for raising tobacco, or for stemming his own tobacco, or that which he purchases from another farmer who grows the tobacco.

If there is such a law, you ask to be referred to it, and to the section thereof, and you ask whether a farmer who grows tobacco can take that tobacco and sell it without paying any tax.

Without attempting to give you an immediate categorical answer to each question as presented, I have the honor to inform you that at the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress by act approved April 12, 1902, section 3, the following law was passed relating to tobacco:

"SEC. 3. That upon tobacco and snuff manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, there shall be levied and collected, in lieu of the tax now imposed by law, the following taxes:

"On snuff, manufactured of tobacco or any substitute for tobacco, ground, dry, damp, pickled, scented, or otherwise, of all descriptions, when prepared for use, a tax of 6 cents per pound. And snuff flour, when sold or removed for use or consumption, shall be taxed as snuff, and shall be put up in packages and stamped in the same manner as snuff.

"On all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine cut, cavendish, plug, or twist, cut or granulated, of every description; on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed, or in any manner other than the ordinary mode of drying and curing, prepared for sale or consumption, even if prepared without the use of any machine or instrument, and without being pressed or sweetened; and on all fine-cut shorts and refuse scraps, clippings, cuttings, and sweepings of tobacco, a tax of 6 cents per pound."

You will not find in this section any exemption in favor of the farmer, who is not privileged to twist, stem, or otherwise change his tobacco and prepare it for consumption.

This section is only a reenactment of section 3368 of the Revised Statutes of 1873, act of July 20, 1868, section 61, and which last act first imposed a stamp tax on tobacco.

This provision of law has been in force continuously, without change except as to the rate of tax, since 1868.

Section 3362 of the Revised Statutes, and amendatory acts, require that all manufactured tobacco and snuff shall be prepared and put up by the manufacturer thereof in certain specified packages and in no other manner before removal for sale or consumption, and provides that all cavendish, plug, and twist tobacco shall be put up in certain packages, and smoking tobacco and all cut and granulated tobacco in certain other packages; and this section makes no exemption in favor of the farmer or grower of tobacco.

The definition of a "manufacturer of tobacco" will be found in subsection 9 of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 69, act of August 28, 1894.

Said section 69 provides that—

"Every person whose business it is to manufacture tobacco or snuff for himself, or who employs others to manufacture tobacco or snuff, whether such manufacture be by cutting, pressing, grinding, crushing, or rubbing of any raw or leaf tobacco, or otherwise preparing raw or leaf tobacco, or manufactured or partially manufactured tobacco or snuff, or the putting up for use or consumption of scraps, waste, clippings, stems, or deposits of tobacco resulting from any process of handling tobacco, or by the working or preparation of leaf tobacco, tobacco stems, scraps, clippings, or waste, by sifting, twisting, screening, or any other process, shall be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco."

The second paragraph of that section provides that—

"Every person shall also be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco whose business it is to sell leaf tobacco in quantities less than a hoghead, case, or bale, or who sells directly to consumers, or to persons other than duly registered dealers in leaf tobacco or duly registered manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons who purchase in packages for export; and all tobacco so sold by such persons shall be regarded as manufactured tobacco, and such manufactured tobacco shall be put up and prepared by such manufacturer in such packages only as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe: *Provided*, That farmers and growers of tobacco who sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising shall not be regarded as manufacturers of tobacco; and so much of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and acts amendatory thereof, as are in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

In the first paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who in any manner prepares his leaf tobacco for consumption by crushing, twisting, stemming, grinding, or otherwise changing the tobacco from its natural condition.

In the second paragraph every person is regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco who sells and delivers leaf tobacco in its natural condition to consumers, or to persons other than registered dealers in leaf tobacco, manufacturers of tobacco or cigars, or persons who buy leaf tobacco in packages for export; and all leaf tobacco so sold by such person is regarded as a manufactured tobacco subject to tax; but there is this exception that farmers and growers are not to be regarded as manufacturers for selling leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising.

You ask for a departmental or judicial definition of the term a "dealer in tobacco."

In reply, you are advised that—

"Every person whose business it is to sell or offer for sale manufactured tobacco, snuff, or cigars shall be regarded as a dealer in tobacco."

The difficulty in the way of a lucid interpretation of the statutes relating to the sale of leaf tobacco by farmers has been that such restrictions have been coupled with special tax provisions and not contained in any separate statutes.

The tenth subdivision of section 3244, Revised Statutes, imposing special tax, exempted a farmer from paying the tax as a dealer in leaf tobacco, but he was required to confine his sales to tobacco of his own production and that received by him from tenants as rent and who produced the same on his land.

This statute also provided that nothing therein should be construed to exempt the farmer or planter from the special tax who, by peddling or otherwise, sold his leaf tobacco at retail directly to consumers.

This provision was also reiterated in section 14, act of March 1, 1879.

The statute imposed upon retail dealers in leaf tobacco a special tax of \$500 per annum and 50 cents for every dollar of sales in excess of \$1,000.

All persons were regarded as retail dealers who sold leaf tobacco directly to consumers, or to persons other than those who had paid special tax as leaf dealers, or manufacturers of tobacco, snuff or cigars, or to persons who purchased leaf tobacco for export.

This, in effect, was a prohibitory tax against the sale of leaf tobacco at retail directly to consumers.

This act was amended by act of March 3, 1883, only so far as it imposed a special tax and provided that retail dealers should pay annually a special tax of \$250 and 50 cents for each dollar on amount of their monthly sales in excess of \$500 per annum.

It was provided, however, that farmers and producers of tobacco could sell, at place of production, tobacco of their own growth or raising at retail directly to consumers to an amount not exceeding \$100 annually.

This was also, in effect, a prohibitory tax against the sale of leaf tobacco to consumers.

The special tax provision was repealed by section 16, act of October 1, 1890. This act, section 27, made it the duty of the farmer to furnish a statement of his sales of leaf tobacco, with the name and residence of the person to whom sold, and the previous limitations on sales were continued, although the special tax had been repealed.

The act of August 28, 1894, repealed the former act requiring farmers to make a sworn statement of their sales, and since that time farmers and growers of tobacco have been privileged to sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising, and that received from tenants as rent for their land, without restriction as to the quantity sold, place of sale, or the business of the persons who purchase the tobacco.

From the foregoing premises I am constrained to answer your questions categorically, as follows:

1. That Congress has never imposed a tax on natural-leaf tobacco in the hands of farmers, but only upon leaf tobacco which they may have sold directly to consumers.

2. Under the present law a tax of 6 cents per pound is imposed upon all tobacco stemmed or twisted by a farmer not intended for his own personal use.

3. A farmer may stem and twist tobacco for his own use without incurring liability to tax on such tobacco.

4. Stemming or twisting tobacco is regarded as manufacturing, and a grower or planter can not lawfully stem or twist his tobacco for sale, or for the purpose of giving it away, without payment of tax. If he should engage in that business, he would be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco and be required to qualify as such by registering with the collector of the district, filing statement and bond, and to pack, label, and stamp his product, as provided by regulations No. 8, pages 5 and 6.

5. I have already given you the legislative definition of term "dealer in tobacco."

6. My answer to question 4 is an answer to question 7.

7. The term "manufacturer of tobacco" is defined in the first and second paragraphs of section 69, quoted on page 3 of my letter.

Respectfully,

J. W. YERKES, *Commissioner.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, February 11, 1904.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, submitting a series of questions upon the subject of the sale of leaf tobacco by farmers and others, and in reply thereto you are advised as follows:

1. Q. What tax or license does a purchaser of leaf tobacco pay to purchase same?—A. None whatever.

2. Q. Is the tax or license on the right to purchase or on the tobacco itself?—A. There is no special tax (license) on the right to purchase, and there is no tax on the tobacco until it is converted into a manufactured product, except as provided in section 69, act of August 28, 1894.

3. Q. When does the tax or license accrue?—A. See answer to question No. 2.

4. Q. Does a manufacturer of tobacco pay any tax or license to make leaf tobacco into manufactured goods?—A. No.

5. Q. Is the tax or license paid when the leaf tobacco is bought or when it is manufactured or when manufactured and actually sold?—A. No special tax (license) is required to be paid when the tobacco is bought. Tax does not accrue until it is converted into a manufactured product and sold or removed from the factory.

6. Q. Can a grower of tobacco sell his own growth of leaf tobacco to another farmer or person for their personal consumption or use without the grower or such person or consumer paying a license or tax, and if anyone has to pay a tax or license, which?—A. No special tax (license) is required to be paid in either case. If, however, the person to whom the farmer sells does not consume the tobacco, but resells it, he must qualify as a dealer in leaf tobacco, and then can only sell to other qualified dealers in leaf, to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons for export, as provided in the law and the regulations.

7. Q. Can a grower sell his own growth of leaf tobacco to an exporter without the grower paying any tax or license?—A. Yes.

8. Q. Does an exporter pay any tax or license to export leaf tobacco or the manufactured article? If yes, is the tax or license on the leaf tobacco or manufactured tobacco, or on the right to buy, or on the right to export? If so, which?—A. An exporter is not required to pay any special tax or license to export either leaf or manufactured tobacco.

9. Q. Can a grower sell his own growth of tobacco to a local buyer of leaf tobacco and that buyer sell that tobacco to an exporter without any tax or license being required of (a) the grower, (b) the local buyer, or (c) the exporter; (d) and if on any one of the three, is the tax or license levied on the individual or the tobacco?—A. Yes. Neither the grower, the local buyer, or the exporter is required to pay any special tax or license under the conditions specified.

10. Q. Can a grower of tobacco sell or give his own growth of leaf tobacco to a consumer without tax or license or limitations under the law or regulations of your Department? If yes, answer fully, giving the amount of tax or license, the law, and the regulations.—A. Yes. The farmer and grower is unrestricted in the sale or other disposition of tobacco in its natural condition of his own growth and raising. This privilege, however, is a personal one, and can not be delegated by the farmer to an agent or other person to sell and deliver the tobacco for him. An agent may find the customer and take orders for sale of the tobacco, but the farmer must make the delivery. (See Treasury decision No. 407, dated April 7, 1902, a copy of which was furnished you in letter addressed to you on the 3d instant.) The farmer is not required to pay any special tax or license for the privilege of selling his tobacco, nor any tax whatever upon the tobacco itself. For the law and the regulations now governing sales of leaf tobacco you are referred to the first and second paragraphs of section 69 of the act of August 28, 1894 (Wilson bill), and to Regulations No. 8, revised July 1, 1903, page 23, a copy of which has already been furnished you.

11. Q. Can the grower sell or give away his own growth of tobacco to any person and neither the grower or such person be required to pay any tax or license? If so, give the amount of the tax or license and the rule of your Department controlling the same. And if there is a tax or license required of such grower or person, is the tax levied on the person that is the grower or the purchaser or on the privilege to sell or give or on the tobacco sold or given away?—A. This question is fully answered in my reply to question No. 10.

12. Q. Why is the grower not allowed to delegate to another person the power or privilege of taking the grower's tobacco and sell or give away that tobacco for the grower? Why is the grower's liberty of action thus curtailed?—A. Under the authority of Congress the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is charged with the duty of making such regulations, rulings, and decisions as will carry the law into effect and safeguard the interest of the Government. To this end this office has deemed it necessary, in Treasury decisions and in correspondence, to confine original sales and deliveries of tobacco to the farmer and grower personally. If he were permitted to sell and deliver his tobacco through the medium of agents or other persons, it would be difficult, and in many cases impossible, to determine whether the tobacco so sold really belonged to the farmer and grower or to the person selling and delivering it. Proviso to section 2 cures this. This office has never abridged or curtailed the rights of the farmer himself to dispose of his tobacco. He can sell and deliver it without the slightest restriction, but when he delegates to other persons this privilege he abrogates his rights under the law, which does not confer this privilege upon any person but the farmer and grower himself.

13. Q. Many of the tobacco growers complain that the tariff act of 1894 and the regulations made thereunder have restricted that liberty of action they had under the McKinley tariff act, which liberty of action they desire now to be restored, and that action defended by the letter of the law against all parties. Will you please put your finger on the difference between these two acts in reference to the grower's right to dispose by sale or gift of his own growth and to deal in leaf tobacco generally without restriction, and then tell me does the same restriction exist under the present law as under the tariff act of 1894; or, in other words, what is the difference between the present law and the McKinley tariff act?—A. Section 27 of the act of October 1, 1890 (the McKinley Act), which is now in force, repealed all statutes imposing any restrictions of any kind whatsoever upon farmers or growers of tobacco in regard to the sale of their leaf tobacco, the keeping of books, etc. The section reads as follows:

"That all provisions of the statute imposing restrictions of any kind whatsoever upon farmers and growers of tobacco in regard to the sale of their leaf tobacco, and the keeping of books, and the registration and report of their sales of leaf tobacco, and imposing any tax on account of such sales are hereby repealed."

The act of June 6, 1872, imposed special taxes upon dealers in leaf tobacco (classed as wholesale dealers) \$25, and retail dealers in leaf tobacco \$500 and 50 cents on every dollar of their sales in excess of \$1,000 per annum, but there was no tax on the leaf tobacco thus sold by the retail dealer. A retail dealer was described as one whose business it was to sell leaf tobacco in quantities less than an original case or bale, or who sold directly to consumers or purchasers other than dealers in leaf tobacco, manufacturers, etc., and they were required to keep books.

Under this act farmers were not required to pay special tax for selling tobacco of their own production or received from tenants, but they could not peddle or sell directly to consumers.

By the act of March 3, 1883, the special tax on retail dealers in leaf tobacco was reduced to \$250 per annum and 30 cents on each dollar of the amount of their monthly sales in excess of the rate of \$500 per annum. These special taxes were all repealed by section 26 of the act of October 1, 1890 (McKinley law), as well as those on the other branches of the tobacco business; but leaf-tobacco dealers, manufacturers, etc., were required to register with the collector the names, style, place of business, etc., the same as though the special tax had not been repealed. In this act (1890) no reference is made to retail dealers in leaf tobacco, thus eliminating that business from the internal-revenue laws.

Under the McKinley Act no restrictions were placed upon subsequent purchasers of leaf tobacco who were not qualified leaf-tobacco dealers or manufacturers during the time that elapsed between the passage of the act of March 1, 1890, and the act of August 22, 1894 (Wilson bill), except that persons who sell leaf tobacco should be regarded as dealers in leaf tobacco, who were authorized to sell only to other dealers in leaf, manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, and cigars, or exporters.

In the act of March 3, 1883, amending subsection 7 of section 3244, appears the proviso:

"That farmers and producers of tobacco may sell at the place of production tobacco of their own growth and raising at retail directly to consumers, to an amount not exceeding \$100 annually."

This provision affected the farmer or producer only, and was repealed by section 27 of the act of October 1, 1890 (McKinley bill), quoted at the beginning of this letter.

Special taxes (licenses) on retail dealers in leaf tobacco were abolished by the McKinley Act, and such retail dealers were not named or recognized in that act. The only sales of leaf tobacco provided for, other than by the farmer or producer, were those by qualified dealers in leaf tobacco, who could sell only to other leaf dealers, manufacturers, or to persons for export.

To recapitulate: Under the McKinley Act the farmer or producer could sell to anyone in any amount at any place. The qualified leaf-tobacco dealers (wholesale) could sell to other qualified dealers, to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, and to such persons as are known to be purchasers of leaf tobacco for export. The country merchant who received leaf in the hand or in quantities from the farmer or producer would have had the right to sell the same if qualified as dealer in leaf tobacco, as defined in subsection 6, section 3244, which reads as follows:

"Every person shall be regarded as a dealer in leaf tobacco whose business it is, for himself or on commission, to sell or offer for sale, or consign for sale on commission, leaf tobacco. Dealers in leaf tobacco shall sell only to other dealers and to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, and to such persons as are known to be purchasers of leaf tobacco for export."

The restrictions imposed upon the sales of leaf tobacco found in section 69, act of August 28, 1894 (the Wilson bill), in which leaf tobacco sold in the manner there described was classed as manufactured tobacco, and taxable as such, were not a part of the McKinley Act of October 1, 1890, but were incorporated in the Wilson bill, doubtless for the reason that the restrictions imposed upon the sale of leaf tobacco by the McKinley Act were not regarded as sufficient to fully protect the interests of the Government.

The impression prevailing in many quarters that under the McKinley Act country merchants and others purchasing leaf tobacco from farmers or producers could sell the same at retail without payment of tax has no foundation in fact or law.

Respectfully,

ROBT. WILLIAMS, JR.,
Acting Commissioner.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, February 3, 1904.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In reply to your verbal inquiry of the 2d instant, as to the difference between the McKinley tariff act of 1890 and the Wilson tariff act of 1894 with reference to the internal-revenue tax and regulations controlling the sale of leaf tobacco, I have the honor to advise you as follows:

THE MCKINLEY ACT OF 1890.

Section 26 repeals all special tax then in force upon dealers in leaf tobacco, retail dealers in leaf tobacco, dealers in tobacco, manufacturers of tobacco, manufacturers of cigars, and peddlers of tobacco, but requires all such dealers to register with the collector of his district his name, or style, place of residence, trade, or business, and the place where such trade or business is carried on. A failure to so register subjects such person to a penalty of \$50.

Section 27 provides that all restrictions of any kind whatsoever upon farmers and growers of tobacco in regard to the sale of their leaf tobacco, and the keeping of books, and the registration and report of their sales of leaf tobacco, or imposing any tax on account of such sales, are repealed; but it is further provided that every farmer or planter producing and selling leaf tobacco, on demand of any internal-revenue officer or other authorized agent of the Treasury Department, shall furnish said officer or agent a true and complete statement, verified by oath, of all his sales of leaf tobacco, the number of hogheads, cases, or pounds, with the name and residence in each instance, of the person to whom sold and the person to whom it is shipped, and every farmer or planter who willfully refuses to furnish such information, or who knowingly makes false statements as to any of the facts aforesaid, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500.

No tax accrues to the Government on account of such sales.

To carry the above law into effect the regulations, series 7, No. 8 revised, issued November, 1890, provided that—

"Farmers are not required to pay an internal-revenue tax for selling leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising or leaf tobacco received by them as rent from tenants who have produced the same on their land."

The previous limitation of an amount not exceeding \$100 annually was repealed by the law above quoted. The executor or administrator of a farmer or planter and the guardian of any minor is exempted from registering as dealer in leaf tobacco for selling tobacco produced by such farmer or planter or by said executor, administrator, or guardian as such, or received by either of them as rents from tenants who have produced the same on the land of said farmer, planter, or minor.

A farmer or planter is not required to pack or prize his tobacco before

offering it for sale, in hogsheads or otherwise, but he may sell it loose, as he has heretofore been in the habit of selling, keeping such an account as will enable him to render a true statement of amount sold when called for.

The Wilson bill, act of August 28, 1894, section 69, provides as follows:

"Every person shall also be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco whose business it is to sell leaf tobacco in quantities less than a hogshead, case, or bale, or who sells directly to consumers, or to persons other than duly registered dealers in leaf tobacco, or duly registered manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons who purchase in packages for export; and all tobacco so sold by such persons shall be regarded as manufactured tobacco, and such manufactured tobacco shall be put up and prepared by such manufacturer in such packages only as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe: *Provided*, That farmers and growers of tobacco who sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising shall not be regarded as manufacturers of tobacco; and so much of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and acts amendatory thereof, as are in conflict with this act are hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That section 27, chapter 124, page 863, Volume I, of Supplement to the Revised Statutes of the United States, be amended by striking out all after the word 'repealed,' in line 5 of said section, as follows: '*Provided, however*, That it shall be the duty of every farmer or planter producing and selling leaf tobacco, on demand of any internal-revenue officer, or other authorized agent of the Treasury Department, to furnish said officer or agent a true and complete statement, verified by oath, of all his sales of leaf tobacco, the number of hogsheads, cases, or pounds, with the name and residence, in each instance, of the person to whom sold and the place to which it is shipped; and every farmer or planter who willfully refuses to furnish such information, or who knowingly makes false statements as to any of the facts aforesaid, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500.' That section 3361 is hereby repealed."

From the above it will be seen that the principal difference between the McKinley Act and the Wilson Act relating to the sale of leaf tobacco by farmers is that under the former act farmers or planters producing and selling leaf tobacco were required, on demand of any internal-revenue officer or other authorized agent of the Treasury Department, to furnish said officer or agent a true and complete statement, verified by oath, of all his sales of leaf tobacco, the number of hogsheads, cases, or pounds, with the name and residence in each instance of the person to whom sold and the person to whom it is shipped; while under the Wilson Act this provision of the law was stricken out, and under the regulations, series 7, No. 8, issued December, 1894, farmers were permitted to sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising in its natural condition without restriction, but leaf tobacco could not be sold free of tax for the farmer on commission or by an agent in the employ of the farmer. The so selling of leaf tobacco by the farmer was construed to be a personal right which he could not delegate to others.

Farmers and growers were not required to pay any internal-revenue tax for selling leaf tobacco received by them as rent from tenants who produced the same on their own land.

In this connection I inclose for your information a copy of Treasury Decision No. 497, issued April 7, 1902, on the subject of sale of leaf tobacco by farmers.

Respectfully,

J. W. YERKES, Commissioner.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIVERNASH].

Mr. LIVERNASH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to plead for justice to the American seaman as an essential condition precedent to the vast over-sea fleet of merchant ships this nation ought to have and the crushing sea power our country should possess.

Sir, to me it is in melancholy keeping with the decline of our once great merchant marine in the foreign trade that gentlemen report bills for building war ships, but do nothing to promote seamanship, and that other gentlemen—of majority or minority—in formally submitting views on that decline say much about ships but not one word of men. Would that I could burn into the minds of the American people that we never can have a truly great navy, we never can have a commanding merchant fleet, until the Congress shall have made sea life so attractive to American boys and men that both will gladly, and may with self-respect, turn to the sea and stay with the sea.

It has not ceased to be true that we should take "care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, in a respectable defensive posture," and the poor glory of our ocean triumph over Spain has not deceived me—we fought a feeble foe. We need a stronger Navy. I am against a large Federal military establishment. Great standing armies are an internal weakness—a burden to industry, a menace to democracy—and experience has proved us able quickly to throw into the field enormous bodies of effective soldiery drawn straight from civil life. But navies are of slow growth, and the sea is for the state which can hold it against the world, able to make its blue deeps a grave for ships and men of alien enemies.

I hope the pending bill will not be impaired. Indeed I should be glad to see it so amended as to require a stronger programme for the building period it covers. Sea power is of the first importance to a nation circumstanced like ours—populous and wealth-strewn continental coasts fronting two oceans and a mighty Gulf; insular possessions in two seas—some of them far distant from our mainland and in the world's forming storm center; a canal to be, which may become in trouble times a death gap to be held against giant foes; an immensely valuable coastwise mercantile marine; alas, that I can not add—the greatest foreign-going merchant fleet on the seven seas! No argument is needed. We shall be guilty of criminal neglect if we do not make our Navy invincible in protection of our seaboard and our ships of trade. I am for strict economy of public funds, but that is not economy but perilous parsimony which, undertaking to provide ocean power for the Republic, stops short of the strength to hold the sea against formidable challengers.

It is not enough to look to The Hague. When universal peace will

Lie like a shaft of light across the land
And like a lane of beams across the sea

the world will be much older. To-day such peace is but the poet's misty dream of things to be. "Most friendship is feigning." Justice among nations is yet largely academic. It may not be relied on without the threatening ethics of ready shot and steel for many a crimsoned age. Diplomacy must go on wearing a shirt of mail under its velvets and its laces. Nations whose weakness is not their strength must go on urging peace, but expecting war; striving to make all life fragrant as the breath of violets while planning to desolate the firesides of its foes.

Justice among the nations! Why, sir, consider the vanished freedom of the Boers, the overwhelming of the people of the Philippines, the disregard of Colombia's right to conquer her revolutionists in Panama if respecting our right to freedom of transit across the Isthmus! What shall be said for justice among the nations when America, the embodiment of world progress from tyranny, forgetting her best traditions and ignoring her noblest ideals, plunges greedily in pursuit of empire?

The Hague! Who does not feel the emptiness of those professions of amiability for which it is famous that observes the Czar of Russia—leader in the declarations for tranquillity—violating the peace of the world in avoidable conflict with Japan, both combatants eager to despoil weaker powers of sovereign rights neither could touch under any rule of human equity?

Navies are more than fleets of war ships. The ships are but weapons. Their value lies in the use made of them. And, ships being equal, mastery is for the nation whose vessels are best manned. It is less a matter of numbers of men than of skill and valor, and often it is not so much a matter of orders from admiral or captain as of response from engine room and stokehold. The manning of a war ship depends largely on the seamen, those below the rank of officers, those whose names the world never hears. A strong suggestion of the real situation lies in these words of Captain Mahan, relative to the period of the French revolution. Then, he says, the one sea weapon—

was the gun; the cold steel, the hand-to-hand fight commonly came into play only toward the end of the action, if at all. In aiming the gun, however, it can by no means be separated from its carriage; using this word not merely in its narrow technical sense, but as belonging rightly to a whole ship which bore the gun alongside the enemy, and upon whose skillful handling depended placing it in those positions of advantage that involved most danger to the opponent and the least to one's self. This was the part of the commander; once there, the skill of the gunner came into play, to work his piece with rapidity and accuracy despite the obstacles raised by the motion of the sea, the rapid shifting of the enemy, the difficulty of catching sight of him through the narrow ports. Thus the skill of the military seaman and the skill of the trained gunner, the gun and the ship, the piece and its carriage, supplemented each other. The ship and its guns together formed one weapon, a moving battery which needed quick and delicate handling and accurate direction in all its parts. It was wielded by a living organism, knit also into one by the dependence of all the parts upon the head, and thus acting by a common impulse, sharing a coming tradition, and having a common life, which, like all other life, is not found full ripened without having had a beginning and a growth.

It matters not how ably, how prudently, the commander of a war fleet plans an engagement with the enemy, nor how terrible the destructive power of his vessels, victory may not be with him should the stokers in the depths of his ships fail to get full value from their coal, the condition precedent to sufficient response from engines, as sufficient response from engines is the condition precedent to exact compliance with the orders given for the moving of that great gun carriage, the man-of-war, for effective firing on or ramming of the foe.

Sir, what are we doing, what does the Committee on Naval Affairs propose we ought to do, to obtain full complements of genuinely skilled seamen for our Navy? There can be but one answer—nothing. The neglect is dangerous and discreditable. It is so regarded by the seamen of our country; it should be so regarded by all others. In saying this I feel I speak as the International Seamen's Union of America would have me speak. It is an organization of most of our seamen. They know the truth. They plead for the remedy. It is for the Congress to act. Will it act?

Sir, it is a lamentable fact that the Secretary of the Navy is driven to the necessity of sending recruiting parties far inland—all through the Mississippi Valley, indeed—to obtain men for recruiting the regular service. Trained seamen are not available. Can the Congress decline to act?

But even if complements were full of men trained at sea and pulsing with the ambitions of men born to sea life, that would not be enough. When the shock of battle comes, complements are broken and must be filled, and if war be lengthy they must be filled again and again. There must be a reserve of citizen seamen, else is there national weakness in crucial hours. What are we doing to create such a reserve?

Gentlemen who have intimate knowledge of the war with Spain must know that during that short struggle there were times when the Navy Department of our country was sorely distressed by

want of a sufficiency of skilled men for stokeholds and gun decks. I wonder how many of us realize the serious significance of that simple fact, and I wonder how many of us have reflected on the truth that it takes longer to train a man to efficient seamanship than it takes to build a battle ship.

So, sir, in the same way ships alone do not make a victory-winning merchant fleet. It is the merchantman whose sails are spread, whose steam is raised by the most expert men which gains and holds carrying trade, other conditions being equal. It always was so and always will be, and the statesmanship which concerns itself much with building ships and little with encouraging the rise of a class of expert seamen is a misfortune to America. The race is for the swift. It will not do to build ships if we do not man them with men the equals or superiors in seamanship of those employed by our competitors, and until we have a great, self-respecting maritime class we can not have a great merchant marine, though we launch ships from a thousand yards.

To conquer the sea as we have conquered the land, we must put American industrial effectiveness at work upon the sea as we have put it at work upon the land; we must make it false that the mariner is one "Housed on the wild sea with wild usages;" we must dignify, we must ennoble seamanship under our flag.

That we have not conquered the sea as we have the land is because we have denied the one the Americanism we have given the other. Our neglect of the seaman has been, I feel, unconscious, take us as a people. Here and there directly interested classes have known, but not the nation as a nation. I absolve the Members of this House from guilty intent, when I make up my own judgments; if I could not, I should almost despair of the future of Democracy.

Briefly, sir, I would remind gentlemen of the plight of our merchant marine in the foreign trade. While we have been rising to wonderful wealth ashore, we have lost our hold at sea. According to the latest annual report of the Commissioner of Navigation of our Department of Commerce and Labor, only 9.1 per cent of our imports and exports was carried in vessels of American register during the year 1903. These figures are familiar. Let me suggest some that are not familiar—some that should impress all gentlemen in whom statesmanship is broader and deeper than the distribution of seeds and pamphlets. Last year—that is, the year ending with June, 1903—the value of our imports and exports carried by foreign ships was \$2,240,000,000.

Apply to this sum the percentage of freight charge commonly accepted as a minimum and we have, sir, the startling conclusion that we paid out in 1903 to foreign bottoms about the same amount of money as we received during the same period as duties at all of the custom-houses of the Republic. It has given me a sorrowful line of thought that in an assembly notable for fervid speeches on tariffs and money reforms the leaders of neither party have devoted even passing notice on this impressive fact. When I consider the influence of freight payments on trade balances, I am the more surprised by this peculiar silence.

Not only has about 90 per cent of our immense over-sea carrying trade fallen into the hands of foreigners—a trade of which at one time we held more than 90 per cent—but a heavy proportion of the 9 per cent yet left us as matter of flag and shipowner, is handled by alien seamen. Of the 100,000 seamen "shipped, re-shipped, and discharged" during 1903, before United States Commissioners, for our entire trade, coastwise and foreign, only 49 per cent were Americans by birth or naturalization. When it is considered that these figures do not include the men shipped in foreign ports (almost all of them aliens), and that the percentage of aliens is lower in the coastwise than the foreign trade, and that the estimate does not exclude officers other than masters, it is conservative to say, as the best authority I know of says, that the alien seamen in our foreign service comprise fully 70 per cent of the entire body of seamen in that service. There is something for thoughtful Americans to ponder on.

The tendency is from the sea. Our seamen instead of becoming more numerous are becoming less numerous. And is it worthy of us that we stand idly by, doing nothing to arrest this endangering drift? What have gentlemen of this body to say? What has the Administration to say?

It is one thing to point an evil; it is another to point a remedy. I trust I shall never be found on this floor engaging in empty criticism—condemning practices or omissions without having given thought to remedial legislation, positive or negative. I scorn insincerity and all straining to throw public problems into the domain of partisanship. To settle some problems parties are, in a democracy, essential, but I trust we shall save the Navy and the seamen of our country from the dangers which lie in partisan division. There should be no substantial differences of opinion concerning the building and maintenance of a powerful navy and the protection of American seamanship. As to these grave matters there should be no Democrat, no Republican. There should be only Americans. [Applause.]

Why is the tendency from the sea? Why do American boys have no call for sea life? Why do American men escape it when they can?

Sir, let me try to tell you.

Sea life, as compared with land life, is unworthy of Americans. It has always been a hard life, and it is not so hard to-day as formerly, perhaps; but land life, also a hard life for the poor, has never been so barren of joy, and during the last thirty or forty years has not been so niggardly of wealth and opportunity, as sea life. I am speaking, understand, of the foreign trade. Some glimmering of Americanism has come to our coastwise trade during recent years, though even in that trade conditions are unbecomingly the dignity of American life, and therefore unattractive to Americans.

True, some Americans go to sea in our foreign-going bottoms, but so some Americans beg for bread. Necessity compels in those cases where an unconquerable love for the waves does not determine. Our ships are charnel places for dead hope.

Sir, suffer me to tell of the reply made not long ago by an American seaman to the question, "Would you send your son to sea in our foreign trade?"

"Would I send my son to sea!" he exclaimed. "Our ships in the foreign trade are filled with men who have failed and are sailed under laws that kill. Rather would I, with my own hands, crush out the life of my son than surrender him to the fate of the seaman whose lot is cast aboard ships of our country trading in foreign ports!"

Why should a father, familiar with the sea, speak so?

Because, sir, in our foreign trade the fore-castle is, as a rule, unfit for habitation, crimping suffered to exist, payment of wages not enough safeguarded, no standard of skill provided, undermanning permitted, Asiatics employed, involuntary servitude protected.

Because, in short, seamen in that trade are not free men, and are obliged to toil under conditions destructive of health, prosperity, self-respect.

If any Member of this body shall, after inspection of average fore-castles in our foreign-going ships, pronounce them fit places for Americans to eat in and sleep in, I shall feel that I have found a man who is wanting in intelligence and humanity.

In our coastwise trade we have about abolished crimping; but we have left the over-sea trade subject to the crimp; and surely no gentleman who knows of the shameful pillage practices of the crimp can excuse neglect to do all in his power for ending them wherever the authority of America can reach.

Again, while our statutes are strewn with provisions implying a standard of skill in seamanship and a standard for manning, no standards have been established. And so it comes to pass that skilled men are overworked and life and property exposed to needless hazard. The manning evil is of the gravest influence. Many and many an American ship in coastwise and in foreign trade goes to sea so badly undermanned that voyaging is one tense struggle for life, and many and many an American vessel is lost as a direct consequence of undermanning.

Moreover, sir, upon the Pacific our seamen are displaced by Asiatics. Every American steamship in our China trade is manned by Chinamen—deck, saloon, galley, stokehold. Think of it! The protection given to Americans ashore against competition with the yellow race is denied their brothers who toil at sea. Can you expect Americans to serve side by side with Chinamen? Would any Member of this Congress submit to have his son share a fore-castle with Chinamen—eat with them, sleep with them, compete for work with them? And the Pacific, remember, is the ocean on which the progress of trade is greatest.

My strength will not permit me to speak to-day of a multitude of minor wrongs of which the seaman is the victim; but I will speak of a wrong not minor, whose character is such as of itself to keep from the over-sea ships of our country the sort of boys, the sort of men, essential to great achievement amidst stern competition with the ships of alien nations. I refer, of course, to the maintenance of involuntary servitude in our foreign-going merchant marine.

Under sections 4596 and 4600 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, the American seaman in our over-sea service is placed outside the grace of the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution. He is the only person under our flag who may not decline his bargain to serve another in civil life without loss of liberty. He may be pursued as fugitive slaves were pursued in the dark days before the civil war if he leave his ship in violation of his civil contract, and may be imprisoned or delivered up to the master of his vessel as felons are delivered up, manacled and disgraced. He may have been lured into the service by the most outrageous frauds, but in practice the fact will avail him nothing. Let him quit the service under penalty of pursuit and irons!

There was recently brought to my attention a case arising be-

fore the repeal of these laws in so far as they related to the coastwise trade—happily they no longer affect that trade. An American seaman, engaged as a cook, left his ship while she was in an Atlantic port. He was apprehended, brought on board, and while the ship remained in port was kept chained to the galley by a chain long enough to enable him to work there—chained as in days all the world blushes to remember slaves were chained to the oars.

And just that practice is yet possible—nay, does obtain—as to seamen under our flag when that flag flies in foreign jurisdictions, not of the near-by trade. Think of it! It is a blistering infamy, out of joint with everything we cherish as American! Liberty! Freedom! The progress of the world demands that no man shall have a right so to sign away his time as that he may not reclaim it on penalty short of a prison cell—not all of his life, nor twenty years of it, nor ten, nor one—no, not the fraction of an hour! The right to personal liberty is, before God, and should be, inalienable!

I am glad to say that the leader on the other side of this Chamber, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], has in other years led, and strongly led, a crusade to destroy this evil utterly. Much of the credit for killing it in the coastwise trade is due to him; and had his will prevailed, the abhorrent practice would not to-day exist anywhere under our flag.

"Where the great offense is let the great ax fall." We may not look on our yesterdays without remorse; let us have heed for our to-morrows. Sections 4596 and 4600 should be repealed. Until they are repealed which of us, sir, would wish to send a boy of his to sea on any ship subject to their un-American provisions?

Granting justice to the seamen of our country should not be made a subject of partisan dispute. It should not be confused with other features of the merchant-marine discussion. If it is intended that those other features shall be referred to a Congressional commission for investigation, then the bill in that regard should be so amended as to make it imperative that such investigation shall uncover the life of the seamen sufficiently to disclose the true relation between ships and men, although such legislation should not be suffered to defer action by this body as to reforms whose value is beyond the need of debate. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to the commission bill, embodying the view I have just expressed.

And now, sir, although I have not consumed the time so generously allotted me, I shall have to conclude, for I am ill; but I am anxious to have printed in the RECORD, as an appendix to my remarks, matter pertinent to the subject I have been discussing; and, after yielding back to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER] the remainder of my time, I ask for unanimous consent permitting the privilege desired. [Loud applause.]

APPENDIX.

[Written by Hon. EDWARD J. LIVERNASH, of California.]

THE AMERICAN SEAMAN.

Transportation by sea can be for a nation a tremendous means of wealth and diffused welfare or the opposite.

Naval power is of immense importance to every country not protected by insignificance, remoteness from the sea, or general incapacity for self-defense. In the case of the United States, acquisition of Hawaii, Guam, Tutuila, the Philippines, and Porto Rico, together with conditions surrounding a canal uniting the Atlantic and the Pacific, has increased the necessity for naval effectiveness. There can be no naval effectiveness without skilled seaman ship, and, other conditions being equal, supremacy is for the fleet having the most expert seamen. That navy, other conditions being equal, will have the greatest reserve of expert seamen which is backed by a maritime national spirit and a powerful, well-manned, self-respecting merchant marine.

The world tendency is at present from the sea. With the United States the tendency from the sea is manifested by capital as well as men, but more by men; and the over-sea merchant marine of this country has all but disappeared, carrying trade considered.

The tendency to impairment of maritime power by movement of men from the sea is met in Europe by national counter tendencies. The United States, both governmentally and otherwise, has been negligent of the dangerous movement carrying Americans from sea life.

To encourage the building of American ships is not necessarily to promote American seamanship or to increase the number of American seamen; American shipowners must be encouraged to seek American seamen, and American boys must be encouraged to turn to the sea and American adult seamen to stay there.

The laws of the United States should be so amended that foreclosures shall be sanitary; that crimping shall cease; that seamen shall be paid on demand in any port of call and on discharge a reasonable percentage of wages earned; that standards of skill for the ratings "ordinary seaman," "able seaman," and "fireman" shall be established; that a minimum scale for the manning of merchant vessels shall be provided and undermanning prohibited; that Asiatics may not serve on shipboard; that imprisonment for violation of civil contract shall not be visited on seamen, and that merchant vessels shall be obliged in some measure to train American boys in practical seamanship.

The foregoing statement will now be considered sentence by sentence.

I. TRANSPORTATION BY SEA CAN BE FOR A NATION A TREMENDOUS MEANS OF WEALTH AND DIFFUSED WELFARE OR THE OPPOSITE.

Von Humboldt's famous conclusion that contact with the ocean has been one of the chief influences in forming the character of nations as well as in adding to their wealth and power is cited as in point. It is enough, further, to remind of the history of the Hanseatic League, Venice, Spain, and Portu-

gal; to point in contrast to vigorous Norway, preserving her maritime spirit, and with a merchant fleet of 1,653,740 tons, most of it in the over-sea trade (British Lloyd's Register for 1903-4); and to quote this paragraph:

"Viewed from whatever standpoint we may choose, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that the British mercantile marine is not only the greatest British industry, but that for its overwhelming importance and far-reaching effect upon mankind it is the most stupendous monument of human energy and enterprise that the world has ever seen." (Bullen's Men of the Merchant Service, p. 1.)

II. SEA POWER IS OF IMMENSE IMPORTANCE TO EVERY COUNTRY NOT PROTECTED BY INSIGNIFICANCE, REMOTENESS FROM THE SEA, OR GENERAL INCAPACITY FOR SELF-DEFENSE.

This is axiomatic. The policy Colbert sought to impose upon France appeals to most men: "To organize seamen and distant commerce in large bodies, like the manufactures and internal commerce, and to give as a support to the commercial power of France a navy established on a firm basis and of dimensions hitherto unknown." And the application of that spirit, as England has applied it, has swept away debatability of the proposition that the ambitions of some nations make needful the nursing of sea power by others. The point of view of the greatest two naval powers of the world is well enough suggested by these statements:

"England still holds her watery dominion; Britannia does still rule the waves, and in this proud position she has spread the English race over the globe; she has created the great American nation; she is peopling new England at the Antipodes; she has made her Queen Empress of India; and is, in fact, the very considerable phenomenon in the social and political world which all acknowledge her to be. And all this she has achieved in the course of three centuries, entirely in consequence of her predominance as an ocean power. Take away her merchant fleets; take away the navy that guards them—her empire will come to an end; her colonies will fall off like leaves from a withered tree, and Britain will become once more an insignificant island in the North Sea for the future students in Australian and New Zealand universities to discuss the fate of in their debating societies." (Froude's English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 1, 2.)

"In all the campaigns of the last seventy years the naval forces have materially influenced and have often decided the result. The conquest of Algiers, the Crimean war, the war in Italy, would have been impossible without the support of the French navy. Naval forces played a great part in the civil war in America, in the struggle between Chile and Peru, in the war between Russia and Turkey, and between Italy and Austria, and, more recently, in the Spanish-American war. The difficult questions connected with the opening up of China will not be decided on the Continent of Europe, but upon the sea, and probably in the Far East, on the Pacific Ocean." (M. Fleury-Bavarin, in report of the committee of the French Chamber of Deputies on the naval estimates for 1901.)

III. IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES, ACQUISITION OF HAWAII, GUAM, TUTUILA, THE PHILIPPINES, AND PORTO RICO, TOGETHER WITH CONDITIONS SURROUNDING A CANAL UNITING THE ATLANTIC AND THE PACIFIC, HAS INCREASED THE NECESSITY FOR NAVAL EFFECTIVENESS.

This, also, is self-evident. "When the sea not only borders or surrounds but also separates a country into two or more parts, the control of it becomes not only desirable, but vitally necessary." (Mahan's Influence of Sea Power upon History, p. 40.)

IV. THERE CAN BE NO NAVAL EFFECTIVENESS WITHOUT SKILLED SEAMANSHIP; AND, OTHER CONDITIONS BEING EQUAL, SUPREMACY IS FOR THE FLEET HAVING THE MOST EXPERT SEAMEN.

The general principle is illustrated in the struggle which engaged Great Britain, France, and Spain at sea in the time of Napoleon.

Captain Mahan's work on *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire* is cited as establishing this proposition: England brought to bear in her conflict with France and Spain a sea force so much better trained in the handling of ships than were the men on whom her adversaries relied that Trafalgar was made possible, and, through Trafalgar, Waterloo.

To the unfortunate influences of the Revolution, which in the end drove the expert sailors of France to desert their calling and to evade naval service, Napoleon added somewhat of contempt for seamanship. "Courage and audacity," says Captain Chevalier, speaking of Bonaparte, "had become, in his eyes, the only qualities necessary to our officers." (Chevalier, *Mar. Fran. sous la Republique*, p. 49.) "The reproach may fairly be addressed to the great Emperor himself," says Captain Mahan, "that he had scarcely any appreciation of the factors conditioning efficiency at sea; nor did he seemingly ever reach any such sense of them as would enable him to understand why the French navy failed." (Mahan's *Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, Vol. I, p. 37.) In the case of the Spaniards the situation is indicated by this quotation from La Graviere:

"The Spaniards at this time were no longer substantial enemies. At the battle of St. Vincent there were scarcely sixty to eighty seamen in each ship of the line. The rest of the crew were made up of men wholly new to the sea, picked up a few months before in the country or in the jails, and who, by the acknowledgment of even English historians, when ordered to go aloft, fell on their knees, crying that they would rather be killed on the spot than meet certain death in trying so perilous a service." (Guerres Mar., Vol. I, p. 164.)

The principle is illustrated in a specific case by the experience of Great Britain in the *Highflyer* and *Minerva* trials. These trials were to test the comparative value of Belleville water-tube boilers, with eighteen of which the first-named cruiser was equipped.

"To get good results, especially in regard to fuel consumption, with a Belleville boiler," writes G. R. Dunnell, "skilled stoking is undoubtedly needed in order to keep the large grate area completely covered with a fire not too thick." (Brassey's Naval Annual, 1901, p. 129.)

The results of the earlier trials were so unfavorable to the Belleville boilers that it was generally believed all the trouble could not be with them, since those results were far less creditable to the boilers than independent tests had given. Accordingly, inquiry was made as to the stoking, and it was found that the men by whom it had been done, to quote the Admiralty report, "had been only recently commissioned for the first time." Subsequently the cruiser, to quote from Brassey's Naval Annual for 1901, page 120, "was sent to sea purposely for training the stokers. A marked improvement [of boiler effectiveness] was the result."

In connection with the experience of the *Highflyer* it is enough to say that in conceivable engagements victory might depend on getting maximum boiler power at a critical time.

Interesting evidence in support of the proposition now discussed is afforded by experience of the United States during the recent war with Spain. A writer in the *North American Review* for March, 1902, after going into the details of the superb handling of the *Oregon*, whereby the great run around

Cape Horn and the immediate response to the battle call off Cuba were rendered possible, says:

"We have gone at some length into this history of the *Oregon* to emphasize the point that the vital factor in the Santiago battle was engineering—a point which is forcibly illustrated, in a negative way, by the utter absence of engineering on the Spanish ships. These vessels were all of excellent design and construction, and none of them was over four years old, the *Colon*, indeed, being less than a year old. All of them had made 19 knots or more on their trial trips; and, had their engineering departments been efficient, they could have run away from our vessels. * * * It is hardly an exaggeration to say that, had the blockaded fleet been composed of vessels of almost any other nationality than Spanish, most if not all of them would have escaped at Santiago." (Some Neglected Naval Lessons, p. 338.)

"A fleet seeking a decisive result must close with its enemy," says Captain Mahan, "but not until some advantage has been obtained for the collision, which will usually be gained by maneuvering, and will fall to the best drilled and manned fleet." (Mahan's Influence of Sea Power on History, note to p. 4.)

The expert use of a ship's guns is, after all, only one branch of a vessel's war value. This is well considered in a paragraph of Captain Mahan's Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire, volume 1, page 38:

"Now, the one sea weapon of the period of the French Revolution was the gun; the cold steel, the hand-to-hand fight, commonly came into play only toward the end of the action, if at all. In aiming the gun, however, it can by no means be separated from its carriage; using this word not merely in its narrow technical sense, but as belonging rightly to a whole ship which bore the gun alongside the enemy, and upon whose skillful handling depended placing it in those positions of advantage that involved most danger to the opponent and the least to one's self. This was the part of the commander; once there, the skill of the gunner came into play, to work his piece with rapidity and accuracy despite the obstacles raised by the motion of the sea, the rapid shifting of the enemy, the difficulty of catching sight of him through the narrow ports. Thus the skill of the military seaman and the skill of the trained gunner, the gun and the ship, the piece and its carriage, supplemented each other. The ship and its guns together formed one weapon, a moving battery which needed quick and delicate handling and accurate direction in all its parts. It was wielded by a living organism, knit also into one by the dependence of all the parts upon the head, and thus acting by a common impulse, sharing a common tradition and having a common life, which, like all other life, is not found full ripened without having had a beginning and a growth."

The statement that "there can be no naval effectiveness without skilled seamanship" is not overcome by considerations having to do with substitution of steam for sail. It is undeniable that as between men, regardless of station, who have been efficiently trained on sailing vessels and men trained exclusively on steamships superiority is with the former.

"It is true," observes the first lord of the British Admiralty, "that no student will ever become a victorious leader unless he is also a practical seaman." (Memorandum of December 16, 1902.)

So, in his latest annual report the Commissioner of Navigation, United States Department of Commerce and Labor, says: "All competent nautical authorities agree that training on a square-rigged ship is necessary for the officer of a steamer. Such training is obligatory in our Navy. The great German steamship companies within the past few years have added several full-rigged ships to their lists as training schools for the future deck officers of their ocean steamers. Unless Congress or private interests soon follow this example, the lack of competent officers for American steamers may soon prove a serious handicap to any development of our ocean steam merchant fleet." (Report for 1903, p. 46.)

And in a volume containing practical examples of the truth of the statement as applied to sailors and others engaged in sea life an English observer declares: "In spite of the immense strides taken by steam navigation the sailing ship is still the only school wherein to train a thorough seafarer." (Bullen's Men of the Merchant Service, p. 15 of preface.)

V. THAT NAVY, OTHER CONDITIONS BEING EQUAL, WILL HAVE THE GREATEST RESERVE OF EXPERT SEAMEN WHICH IS BACKED BY A MARITIME NATIONAL SPIRIT AND A POWERFUL, WELL-MANNED, SELF-RESPECTING MERCHANT MARINE.

Sea power is not necessarily a matter of ships of war only, even though at the moment they be adequately manned. No nation can afford to maintain in times of peace a trained naval force in the regular service sufficiently extensive for the requirements of a long, exhausting war. Dependence must be on the merchant marine to recruit the broken complements; and in that stage where two warring nations have resort to such recruiting it may fare ill with the one whose merchant marine is the less skilled.

"The sea power of England, therefore," observes Captain Mahan, "was not merely in the great navy with which we commonly and exclusively associate it. France had had such a navy in 1688, and it shriveled away like a leaf in the fire. Neither was it in a prosperous commerce alone. A few years after the date at which we have arrived, the commerce of France took on fair proportions; but the first blast of war swept it off the seas as the navy of Cromwell had once swept that of Holland. It was in the union of the two, carefully fostered, that England made the gain of sea power over and beyond all other states." (Mahan's Influence of Sea Power upon History, p. 325.)

"A permanent force not supported by reserves [trained in the merchant marine] can not adequately supply the means of reinforcement in the time of war," is the conclusion of Lord Brassey, commenting on the British navy. (Brassey's Naval Annual, 1901, p. 3.)

In Brassey's Naval Annual for 1898 the same eminent authority observes: "It is essential in the public interest to improve the merchant navy as a nursery for seamen."

Indeed, in all of Lord Brassey's writings for many years he has discussed the manning of the British navy and the manning of the British merchant marine as two branches of the same problem.

Mr. T. A. Brassey, commenting on the British navy, gives this suggestion of the relation between full ship complements in time of peace and the reserve power which should be ready to hand: "We require 50,000 men beyond the number necessary to make up the complement of ships available at the outbreak of war to replace losses and to utilize the shipbuilding resources to which we have alluded above," his allusion having been made to a statement of the shipbuilding resources of England, followed by this comment:

"But the power of constructing ships rapidly will be useless unless we know whence to draw the men to man the ships when built." (Brassey's Naval Annual for 1898, pp. 103, 104.)

The United States Commissioner of Navigation, in his report for 1899, says: "The merchant marine must be relied on to furnish the seamen (in the comprehensive sense including the fire-room force) needed in emergency to man war vessels." (P. 26.)

In truth, men can not quickly be brought to a high degree of efficiency in seamanship, whether on deck or in the stokehold. The Chief of the United States Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, has said:

"The fact should not be lost sight of that it requires a much longer time

to produce a naval officer than it does to produce a battle ship." (Report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1901, p. 523.)

The same observation could with justice be made with relation to the training of a thoroughly skilled seaman, and the apprentice period of seamanship in the United States Navy, four years, is cited as in point.

The House Committee on Naval Affairs, Fifty-eighth Congress of the United States, in a report accompanying the last naval appropriation bill, has presented the following results of inquiries concerning present naval reserve of foreign countries:

"In the navies where service is compulsory, as is the case with all the eight considered, except England and the United States, there are large numbers of trained men who have served their enlistments at sea and are held ready as reserves. This gives such navies an enrolled and effective force, which in some cases is larger than its force in regular service; thus, Germany is said to be able to reman her fleet two or three times. The figures given below are such as are obtainable at short notice.

"England is said to have a total effective reserve of 72,000 men. Of these, the most valuable are the Royal Naval Reserves, consisting of 1,500 lieutenants, ensigns, and midshipmen, 400 engineers, and 26,000 blue jackets. Of these, 100 line officers and 100 engineers are training with the regular service, the line officers serving regularly on the larger ships for periods of one year.

"France has 468 reserve officers. If her reserves were used to fill up the complements of all her ships there would still be left 19,000 blue jackets as a reserve.

"Germany has 378 reserve officers and 75,000 reserve blue jackets.

"No figures for Russia are obtainable.

"The blue jackets in Italy's first and second reserves number 33,123.

"Japan has 1,480 line and engineer officers in her reserves, and in 1902 she had 5,985 reserve blue jackets.

"Austria has 68 reserve officers of the line and engineers. One authority estimates her reserve of blue jackets at 20,000. A blue jacket, after an enlistment of four years, goes into the first reserve for five years and then into the second reserve for another three years."

The situation of the United States in this regard is thus summarized by the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department:

"It should be borne in mind that the United States possesses no adequate merchant marine from which to draw seamen for its Navy." (Report of the Secretary of the Navy, 1901, pt. 1, p. 525.)

"The subject of a national naval reserve has been under consideration by the general board as well as by the Bureau of Navigation, and it is the intention of the Bureau to take up this subject more actively in the near future." (Annual Report of Chief of the Bureau of Navigation for 1903, p. 36.)

President Roosevelt observed in his message to the Fifty-seventh Congress at the beginning of its second session:

"Each individual unit of our navy should be the most efficient of its kind as regards both material and personnel that is to be found in the world. I call your special attention to the need of providing for the manning of the ships. Serious trouble threatens us if we can not do better than we are now doing as regards securing the services of a sufficient number of the highest type of sailormen, of sea mechanics.

"The veteran seamen of our war ships are of as high a type as can be found in any navy which rides the waters of the world; they are unsurpassed in daring, in resolution, in readiness, in thorough knowledge of their profession. They deserve every consideration that can be shown them. But there are not enough of them. It is no more possible to improvise a crew than it is possible to improvise a war ship. To build the finest ship, with the deadliest battery, and to send it aloft with a raw crew, no matter how brave they were individually, would be to insure disaster if a foe of average capacity were encountered. Neither ships nor men can be improvised when war has begun."

In the famous pamphlet written by Herr A. von Wenckstern for the information of the German nation, a showing is made of comparative future naval strength of the great powers, and the Militar Literatur Zeitung is moved to conclude, in reviewing the publication, that England and the United States will soon be checked in the increase of their navies by the question of manning the ships, as Japan will be by the question of money. (Notes on Naval Progress, Office of United States Naval Intelligence, November, 1899, pp. 17-25.)

VI. THE WORLD TENDENCY IS AT PRESENT FROM THE SEA.

To the foregoing proposition there are three notable exceptions and a strong tendency toward a fourth. Japan, China, and India have a steadily increasing number of seamen, and Germany is reaching out in a sure, aggressive fashion, with German capital and German brawn striking seaward together.

Mr. T. A. Brassey, writing in the British Naval Annual for 1898, said:

"In the mercantile marine the number of British seamen is diminishing year by year, and unless steps are taken to prevent, it will diminish still more rapidly in the future." (P. 105.)

After presenting statistics showing the decrease to which he had referred, he quoted Mr. Clark Hall, as follows:

"From these figures it would appear that the falling off in these ratings occurs mainly among the young British seamen, as boatswains, quartermasters, who are chiefly recruited from the 'sailor ratings,' and as sailors do not ordinarily enter the sea service after they are 25 years of age, this falling off in the number of young British sailors affects the source of supply of our future petty officers and older able seamen." (P. 105.)

That Mr. Brassey's forecast of continuing diminution of the number of British seamen was not unduly pessimistic the most recent statistics establish. Lord Brassey, in the British Naval Annual for 1901, observes:

"Fifty years ago we had 200,000 British seamen in our mercantile marine; we have scarcely half that number at the present time. Our British A. B.'s and firemen in the over-sea trade will soon be outnumbered by foreigners and Lascars. * * * The falling off in numbers is the more deplorable because it is mainly amongst the younger men. The state of things is grave and calls for the attention of statesmen." (P. 153.)

Further on in the same publication this marine expert adds:

"The time has now come when the adoption of every practical means to prevent the disappearance of British seamen from our foreign-going ships should be considered." (P. 159.)

So, in the report of the committee appointed by the British Board of Trade to inquire concerning questions affecting the mercantile marine, it is said:

"There is no doubt of the fact of the increase of foreigners employed and corresponding decrease of British seamen employed in the mercantile marine.

"The statistics of the registrar-general of shipping and seamen, obtained in question 12065, show that in 1888 there were employed on British merchant vessels 158,959 British and 24,990 foreign seamen; in 1901 the numbers were 151,376 and 37,174, respectively, a decrease of 7,583 British and an increase of 12,184 foreign seamen in thirteen years. (These figures include officers in all cases, there being very few foreign officers.)

"According to a table handed in by the registrar-general, based on a census taken on the 31st of March, 1901, there were then employed on British merchant vessels 120,412 British and 32,614 foreign seamen. These figures are

shown in detail in the return published as a Parliamentary return in 1902, which also shows that when a similar census was taken on the 25th of March, 1896, there were 125,009 British and 27,446 foreign seamen. Thus in the quinquennial period the decrease in the number of British seamen amounted to 4,597 and the increase in the number of foreign seamen amounted to 5,163.

"Coincident with the diminution in the number of British seamen and the increase in the number of foreign seamen employed there has been a very considerable increase in the number of Lascars (natives of India) and other Asiatic seamen employed on British merchant vessels. The number of Asiatics on Asiatic articles of agreement is shown as 18,427 in 1888, and as 37,431 in 1901. In the census of the 31st of March, 1901, 33,610 Lascars (including all Asiatics on Asiatic articles of agreement) were enumerated, as compared with 27,911 in the census of the 25th of March, 1896." (Report to the president of the board of trade, May 7, 1903.)

The plight of England is the plight of nearly every other country, with the exceptions named—exceptions entitled to receive the most earnest consideration of public men.

There is nothing accidental or surprising in this nearly world-wide tendency.

Lord Brassey, writing many years ago, after the committee of shipowners, formed at Liverpool in 1870, had reported serious movement of British seamen from the sea and pronounced deterioration of seamanship among the citizens of Britain, observed:

"Where wages are good or the conditions of life agreeable and salubrious labor is abundant. It is scarce or of very inferior quality in occupations which are ill paid or disagreeable. When, therefore, we hear louder and more grievous complaints from shipowners than from employers in other trades, we may attribute the scarcity of competent mariners to the superior advantages afforded by occupations on shore." (The British Navy, by Sir Thomas Brassey, vol. 5, pt. 5, British Seamen, p. 97.)

Mr. T. A. Brassey says, in the British Naval Annual for 1898 (p. 106), in the course of a discussion of incentives for British boys to turn to the sea:

"Whether the prospect of earning a retaining fee of £6 a year before they were 21 and a pension at the age of 60 would attract British lads in sufficient numbers into the mercantile marine and naval reserve may be questioned. The wages and conditions of employment at sea compare unfavorably with those of skilled workers ashore. For the latter they have immensely improved in the last fifty years. For the former they have improved, but not in the same degree. Wages in Liverpool on the Australian voyage were 50 shillings a month in 1850; they were at 55 shillings last year. The cheapening in the cost of food has gone into the pocket of the workman ashore; afloat it has gone into the pocket of the shipowner."

Lord Brassey, in the British Naval Annual for 1901, says:

"The state of things leaves much to be desired. It will be admitted that those who follow the sea are insufficiently compensated in pay for the social privations of a calling in which the breadwinner must leave his home to earn his livelihood." (P. 153.)

The latest authoritative statement in this regard as to the seamen of Great Britain is strictly confirmatory of the first-quoted conclusion by Lord Brassey. In the report of the committee appointed by the British board of trade in 1902 to inquire into certain questions affecting the British mercantile marine it is said:

"Various causes have been assigned for the decrease in the number of British seamen in the mercantile marine, but we do not doubt that the main cause is the superior attractiveness of shore employment, with its greater comforts and superior facilities for the maintenance of a home." (Report to the president of the board of trade, May 7, 1903.)

Mr. Andrew Furuseth, testifying before the United States Industrial Commission at Washington, February 13, 1900, while chairman of the legislative committee of the International Seamen's Union of America, made this statement:

"The question has often been raised, Why do not American boys go to sea? To begin with, because there is not any prospect for a man to make a living and keep a family by going to sea. * * * Now, a boy may go to sea out of romance; he may read Captain Marryat and the rest of the writers, and get into his head that he wants to be a sailor; and he goes to sea and makes one or two trips. Then he finds out what the sea is, what kind of a life a sea life is, what kind of work he has to do, what kind of wage he is likely to receive when he is a grown man; and when he finds out he says, 'There is nothing in this for me,' and quits and looks around for something else to do."

"And it is thus not only in the United States, but in other countries. Norway, for example, used to furnish an enormous number of seamen. When I first went to sea, the wage of the Norwegian seaman in purchasing power was such that he was really better off than the ordinary mechanic on shore. Ninety per cent of the seamen were married and had little homes of their own in the little gullies along the seacoast, or wherever they might happen to be, and these homes were neater and usually a little better furnished than those of the ordinary mechanics. Since then the condition of shore employment has improved in Norway to such an extent that the standard of living of the shore mechanic has risen much above that of the seaman. Accordingly the Norwegian boy does not go to sea, as he used to do. The Norwegian vessels are very largely filled with Swedes and Finns. So, Englishmen used to go to sea for the same reason and under the same conditions as the Norwegians. The wages of the English sailor to-day run between £4 and £6 a month—between \$20 and \$30 a month, around England, that is. But he can make a great deal more wages ashore, and be with his family, if he have one, getting better wages by working there. The boy who has the stuff in him to make a sailor must be healthy and must have fair average intelligence; and in order that he may be willing to go to sea and stay there the conditions of sea life must be such as to give him the ability to live in somewhat the same way as his neighbors do—come up at least to the ordinary standard of living of persons of his own station ashore—those he has been brought up with. And sea life which will not do that will not keep for any length of time those persons who go to sea."

"On an average now the sailor goes from port to port looking for some other occupation. He comes into New York, for instance, and he gets paid off with \$30 or \$40 or \$50 after a long trip. The first thing he does after reaching port, * * * in the majority of cases, is to go into the employment offices to see whether there is any land work obtainable, and if there is anything he can get to do he is glad to quit the sea. He becomes a bridge builder, or an architectural ironworker, preferably. I suppose that 75 per cent of the men who work at architectural ironwork in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago are sailors. Or, he becomes a gripman on a street car. * * * He finds that architectural ironworkers get \$3.50 a day, say, and he obtains employment among them, and then says, 'Good-by sea; I am done with you.' Now, that is the meaning of desertion of the sea, and the meaning of it in England as it is with us. Along with all this there comes an additional consideration, that the calling which will not produce sufficient for the support of a family is looked down upon by nearly everybody, and at present there is no calling so looked down upon in this country and in England as the seafaring calling, as going to sea. The ordinary man on shore speaks about the sailor as 'a poor fellow'; as one who would not go to sea if he were fit for anything else; as one not worth much, anyway. This is about the idea, and he loses social

caste by going to sea, loses the respect of the people with whom he has been associated; and that, too, tends to prevent men from going to sea." (Report of Hearing on Transportation, Industrial Commission, 1900, pp. 695, 696.)

VII. WITH THE UNITED STATES THE TENDENCY FROM THE SEA IS MANIFESTED BY CAPITAL AS WELL AS MEN, BUT MORE BY MEN; AND THE OVER-SEA MERCHANT MARINE OF THIS COUNTRY HAS ALL BUT DISAPPEARED, CARRYING TRADE CONSIDERED.

Thomas Jefferson, in a report on those nurseries of seamen, the deep-sea fisheries, while he was Secretary of State, said: "The loss of seamen unnoticed would be followed by other losses in a long train. If we have no seamen, our ships will be useless, consequently our ship timber, iron, and hemp; our shipbuilding will be at an end; ship carpenters will go over to other nations; our young men will have no call to the sea; our products, carried in foreign bottoms, be saddled with war freight and insurance in time of war."

While sea life as compared with land life was, however unsatisfactory, relatively attractive, and the Federal Government gave to American shipping and American mariners direct protection against foreign competition, there was no tendency from the sea and none of the misfortunes Jefferson believed would follow loss of seamen. But when change of governmental policy as to ships and men conspired with rapidly increasing attractiveness of land life, there set in a strong drift from the sea, and all that Jefferson believed would be consequential has come to pass.

Captain Mahan, taking a general view of the United States, has sweepingly said: "Its merchant service has disappeared." (Mahan's Influence of Sea Power upon History, p. 26.)

The tonnage of American ships engaged in the foreign trade is utterly out of proportion to the foreign commerce of the United States, and the number of citizen seamen employed in that trade is even more unsatisfactory.

"Our foreign commerce last year amounted to two billion and a little over three hundred million dollars," declared Senator FRYE, in addressing the Senate of the United States on the 3d of March, 1902, and then continued:

"We carried 8.2 per cent. Our exports last year amounted to \$1,487,000,000. We carried 6 per cent of it under the American flag. Last year we reached the climax of our decadence. If you will examine the Report of Commerce and Navigation, you will find that there did not enter or clear a single American vessel from Germany, or Russia, or Sweden, or Norway, or Denmark, or the Netherlands, or Austria-Hungary, or Italy, or Greece, or Turkey; that one cleared from Belgium in ballast, one from Spain in ballast, and two from France, one of them in ballast."

"For 1903," says the Commissioner of Navigation, United States Department of Commerce and Labor, "American vessels carried 9.1 per cent of our exports and imports." (Annual Report for 1903, p. 10.)

The same officer reports the following named consulates as stating that "no American vessels entered or cleared during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903:"

"Austria-Hungary—Fiume, Trieste; Denmark—Copenhagen; France—Brest, Cannes, Dieppe, Dunkirk, Havre, Lorient, Marseille, Mentone, Monaco, Nantes, Nice, St. Malo, St. Nazaire, Rouen; Germany—Brake and Nordenham, Bremen, Bremerhaven, Danzig, Königsberg, Stettin, Swinemünde; Greece—Athens; Italy—Ancona, Bari, Cagliari, Catania, Civita Vecchi, Genoa, Girgenti, Leghorn, Licata, Naples, Palermo, Trapani; Netherlands—Flushing, Rotterdam, Schiedam; Norway and Sweden—Bergen, Christiania, Gothenburg, Helsingborg, Malmö, Stavanger, Stockholm; Portugal—Faro, Lisbon, Oporto, Setubal; Azores (islands)—Flores, San Jorge, and Terceira; Madeira Islands—Funchal; Russia—Batumi, Libau, Odessa, Revel, Riga, St. Petersburg; Spain—Almería, Barcelona, Cadiz, Carthagena, Corunna, Denia, Malaga, San Feliu de Guixols, Seville, Tarragona, Valencia, Vigo; Canary Islands—La Palma; Turkey—Alexandria, Alexandretta, Beirut, Dardanelles, Mersine, Port Said, Suez; United Kingdom—Bristol, Carlisle, Falmouth, Gloucester, Hull, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Plymouth, Sunderland, West Hartlepool, Belfast, Cork, Dublin, Galway, Limerick, Londonderry, Waterford, Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Greenock, Troon, Cardiff, Gibraltar, Malta Islands, Scilly Islands. British North America: New Brunswick—Moncton; Ontario—Kingston; Prince Edward Island—Alberton; Georgetown, Summerside; Quebec—Gaspé, Paspébiac, Quebec, Rimouski. Central America: Honduras—Amapala. Mexico—Tuxpan. West Indies: Albert Town, Bonaire, Dunmore Town, Nevis. South America: Brazil—Ceara, Para; Ecuador—Esmeraldas; Venezuela—Barcelona, Puerto Cabello. Africa: Algiers, Casa Blanca, Mogador, Tamatave, Tangier, Tunis, Zanzibar. Asia: China—Chefoo, Hankau, Nankin, Nuchwang, Saigon; India—Bombay, Calcutta, Ceylon (island), Penang; Siam—Bangkok; Celebes—Macassar; Java—Batavia; Sumatra—Padang. Australia: Townsville; New Zealand—Christchurch, Dunedin." (Annual Report for 1903, p. 100.)

And this weakness of merchant fleet should be viewed in contrast with the long term of years when the American flag was on every sea and our share of the carrying trade of our imports and exports ranged above 70 per cent and reached more than 92 per cent. (Annual Report of the Commissioner of Navigation to the United States Secretary of Commerce and Labor for 1903, pp. 288, 289.)

The decline of the American merchant marine in its strictly financial aspect is of extremely grave importance.

"An amount of money not less than \$4,500,000,000, or an average of \$150,000,000 for thirty years past," wrote William W. Bates in 1892, "has been paid out to foreign ships for ocean transportation. To stop this drain nothing effective has been done." (American Marine, p. 25.)

Since Mr. Bates made his estimate the imports and exports of the United States have steadily grown and the tonnage of American over-sea carriers has rapidly declined, with corresponding loss of national income.

For the fiscal year 1903 the value of our imports and exports carried in foreign bottoms was \$2,026,102,388. (Annual Report of the Commissioner of Navigation to the United States Secretary of Commerce and Labor for 1903, p. 230.)

Applying to the 1903 valuation of imports and exports a minimum percentage of freight charge, it will be found that about the same sum was paid to foreign ships for carrying those imports and exports as was collected during 1903 as customs duties at all the ports of this country.

In the coastwise trade of the United States the tonnage is American because the Congress has excluded from that trade vessels of foreign register; but the prohibition established against ships of foreign register does not extend to foreign seamen under the rank of officers, and it is unchallenged that the coastwise as well as foreign-going ships of this country are in the main manned by aliens.

Unfortunately our laws provide for nothing like complete registration of seamen. Hence statistics submitted by the United States Commissioner of Navigation have little value either as to number or nationality of any class of seamen shipped on American vessels. No distinction is made in the statistics between men shipped and men reshipped; between sailors and seamen of other classifications—stokers and stewards, for example—between coastwise and over-sea service. Moreover, no statistics are reported by his Bureau showing the nationality of men shipped in American vessels in foreign jurisdictions.

Taking the Commissioner's latest figures as only loosely indicating conditions, accordingly, it appears that in 1903 the nationality of seamen "shipped, reshipped, and discharged" on vessels carrying our flag was as follows: Americans by birth, 36,761; Americans by naturalization, 22,737; aliens, 61,287. (Annual Report for 1903, p. 27.)

It should be borne in mind in considering the Commissioner's figures that his estimate does not distinguish between officers and seamen below the rank of watch officers. Accordingly the scarcity of citizen seamen is even greater than appears upon the surface. The proportion between officers and engineers on the one hand and sailors and firemen on the other is shown by the United States Census Reports to be approximately as one to four.

It should further be borne in mind that the Commissioner's estimate does not extend to men shipped and discharged in foreign ports. "Relatively few of the men shipped and discharged abroad," he observes, "are American citizens by birth or naturalization, and the proportion of foreigners in crews of American vessels is correspondingly larger than appears in the tables of men shipped before the shipping commissioners in the United States." (Annual Report for 1903, p. 28.)

Another significant fact in connection with the tendency from the sea is the passing of the apprentice system, on which in other times we relied to a considerable extent for renewal of our seafaring class. "The apprentice system," says the United States Commissioner of Navigation, "has virtually ceased to exist on American merchant vessels." (Report of Commissioner of Navigation, 1899, p. 60.)

VIII. TENDENCY TO IMPAIRMENT OF SEA POWER BY MOVEMENT OF MEN FROM THE SEA IS MET IN EUROPE BY NATIONAL COUNTER TENDENCIES.

The movement from the sea has aroused the anxiety of Europe; and not only are European statesmen earnestly seeking a way of overcoming that movement, but the greater nations are being profoundly stirred by patriotic organizations of private citizens devoted to maritime progress.

In 1894 the British Navy League was founded. "Since then," says Lieut. Orlo S. Knepper, staff intelligence officer, United States Navy, "it has grown rapidly and has branches in most of the principal cities of England, many of the schools and colleges, and in nearly every British colony the world over." (Notes on Naval Progress, Office of United States Naval Intelligence, July, 1901.)

From the constitution of the British Navy League these words are taken:

"This association shall be called 'The Navy League.' Its purpose shall be to secure, as the primary object of the national policy, the command of the sea." The general aims of the Navy League shall be: (a) To spread information showing the vital importance to the British Empire of the naval supremacy upon which depend its trade, empire, and national existence. (b) To call attention to the enormous demands which war may make upon the navy, and to the fact that the navy is not strong enough to meet them, and at all times to point out any shortcomings in this respect. (c) To call attention from time to time to such measures as may be requisite to secure adequate preparation for the maritime defense of the Empire.

This league publishes and circulates books and pamphlets, and issues a monthly journal, all designed to arouse in the British Empire a lively appreciation of weaknesses in navy or merchant marine, to inspire maritime pride, and to promote maritime strength.

"The number of foreign seamen in the British merchant marine has increased from 9 per cent in 1860 to nearly 41 per cent in 1897," observes Lieutenant Knepper. "As in time of war England's naval reserve would be largely drawn from her merchant marine, this condition of affairs is most undesirable, and the Navy League has taken up the problem of manning the merchant marine by Englishmen and generally raising the standard of the merchant seamen." (Notes on Naval Progress, Office of United States Naval Intelligence, July, 1901, p. 351.)

"The German Navy League, modeled largely after the British Navy League," continues this expert, "was organized April 30, 1898. Since that time its growth has been almost phenomenal. It has been in keeping with the enormous strides Germany has made for commercial and maritime supremacy, and in a great measure has been the cause of those strides. * * * The Emperor and the Government are strong supporters of the league, and in nearly every province some German prince is at its head." (Notes on Naval Progress, Office of United States Naval Intelligence, July, 1901, pp. 351, 352.)

The progress of this organization is shown by the following quotation from a paper by John Leyland, in the British Naval Annual for 1901:

"The German Navy League is a most prosperous organization, which has exerted a great deal of influence during the campaign in favor of the navy act. In support of this agitation more than 6,000,000 books and pamphlets were published at the expense of the league, while 3,000 lectures and addresses were delivered, followed by 600 more in the latter part of the year. * * * At the annual meeting of the league in January, under the presidency of Prince zu Wied, it was announced that during the year 1900 the number of members had increased from 246,967 to 599,141, and the number of branches from 286 to 1,010. * * * The organization of the league now extends over the whole country." (P. 45.)

"The French Navy League," pursues Lieutenant Knepper, "inspired by and modeled after the British Navy League, was organized early in 1899. In publishing the first list of adherents to the league Senator Landry, referring to the British review at Spithead, July of 1897, wrote:

"An eyewitness to the marvelous results obtained by the English Navy League, my great desire was that my country should possess a similar organization. Since then I have become more and more convinced that much good can be done by the French league. Thanks to the support which will come from all sides, the founders of the league will obtain the object which they have in view, which is to create a maritime movement in the country." (Notes on Naval Progress, Office of United States Naval Intelligence, July, 1901, p. 355.)

One of the principal purposes of this French league is thus expressed in the constitution of the organization:

"To cooperate, to aid, and concentrate its efforts * * * in the improvement and general interests of our merchant marine."

Similar leagues have sprung up in other European countries.

All sorts of proposals are at present under consideration in Great Britain for persuading British boys to pursue seamanship as a profession in the merchant marine, and to encourage British shipowners to accept the services of such boys. The basis of nearly all of these proposals is concern for the safety of England in the event of an exhausting naval conflict, wherein her regular naval force would have to be renewed. There is widespread recognition of the truth that to rely in times of stress upon naval recruits not inured to the sea is to court such disaster as befell France and Spain at Trafalgar.

"I have from time to time put forward a scheme, based on the recommendations of the Manning Commission of 1880," says Lord Brassey, in the British Naval Annual for 1901. "It was proposed that the Government should train boys for the reserve by entering them as apprentices, indentured to an official of the board of trade, and to remain under his supervision. They were to be sent to sea for four years in selected sailing ships, and afterwards join the reserve. A subsidy was proposed of £20 to the shipowner and

£15 to the apprentice on the satisfactory completion of the apprenticeship. Under the conviction of the necessity of taking some action, the Imperial Government, at the close of the session of 1898, introduced a clause into the merchant shipping act providing for a reduction of the light dues to owners of ships carrying apprentices.

"The scheme failed because the inducements were inadequate. I have endeavored to show that the increasing requirements for the naval reserve can only be met by dealing with the training of boys on a comprehensive plan and with the aid of the State. Better terms should be offered to the shipowners and stricter conditions insisted upon. * * * The number of prime seamen in the merchant marine is diminishing, and without the aid of the State in training must continue to diminish." (Pp. 159, 160.)

France recruits her navy systematically from her merchant marine, safeguarding training in seamanship by rigorous provisions of law. The French inscription marine contains 114,000 seamen. The fisheries and the mercantile marine of France supply annually some 4,000 men for deck duties in the navy. For the engine-room complements it is necessary to have recourse to voluntary enlistment, some 3,000 men being annually entered and specially trained. (British Naval Annual for 1901, p. 3.)

Other European powers also systematically recruit their navies from their merchantmen, returning them to the merchant service after giving them a thorough naval training.

France and Germany, when they pay postal subsidies to steamship companies, are solicitous to bind those companies to employ practically none but citizen seamen. All of the mail contracts carrying subsidies during the last several years are cited in support of this statement.

Two-thirds of the crews of vessels of Norway and Sweden must be subjects. (Report of United States Commissioner of Navigation for 1899, pt. 1, p. 22.)

Other maritime nations of Europe have statutory provisions designed in one way or another to encourage employment of their own subjects aboard their own ships.

In the same way various foreign governments have within recent years substantially altered their maritime laws in such manner as to make sea life under their flags less and less undesirable as compared with land life. Norway is especially cited, and Germany also.

The most recent amendment of German law (June 2, 1902) effects numerous important improvements of conditions among seamen aboard the merchant ships of the Empire, notably these: Establishing ten hours, including anchor or night watch, as the maximum day's work in temperate climate and eight hours in the Tropics, with pay for overtime, except in critical emergencies; enacting that every officer shall have eight hours for sleep out of twenty-four; requiring watch and watch at sea, except in the engineering department, the watch below to be called only under urgent need; providing for three alternating watches in the engineering department in the case of vessels having runs of more than ten consecutive hours; prohibiting work other than for safety of vessel and in standing anchor or night watch while in safe harbor on Sundays and legal holidays; prohibiting work other than for safety and speed of vessel and in preparation of food at sea on Sundays and legal holidays; forbidding the master, either as measure of reproof or to oblige to immediate obedience, from imposing fines, shortening provisions for more than three consecutive days, imprisoning, or administering corporal punishment.

IX. THE UNITED STATES, BOTH GOVERNMENTALLY AND OTHERWISE, HAS BEEN NEGLIGENT OF THE DANGEROUS MOVEMENT CARRYING AMERICANS FROM SEA LIFE.

While Europe has been striving to arrest the tendency from the sea, America has been comparatively remiss, both as to the Navy directly and the merchant marine.

No strong effort has been made to establish anything corresponding to the system whereby the merchantmen of England are drawn upon for the training of a naval reserve. The Secretary of the Navy has made recommendations in line with European progress, but with no avail. In his latest report on that subject to the President he renews his advice in these words:

"I have again to call attention to the pressing need of a national naval reserve force from which to draw for sea service immediately upon an outbreak of war. The subject has received attention in previous reports, and recommendations have been made for the enrollment and organization of such a national body, to be under the general direction of the Navy Department and subject to the call of the Chief Executive in times of national emergency. The results of the Spanish-American war were such as assure everyone having knowledge of naval matters that steps should at once be taken to meet the one certain and positive requirement which will face the nation upon an outbreak of war—the immediate necessity at that exigent time, if it comes, of a large increase in the men of the Navy from an existing reserve—an increase which must, in the main, be made from the seafaring class, who, having acquired the habit of the sea, are at home on the water." (Report of Secretary of the Navy, 1901, pt. 1, p. 8.)

In a report to the Secretary of the Navy the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation urges "the necessity of establishing a national naval reserve which should be composed of able-bodied men who are or who have been connected with a seafaring life." (Annual Report of the Navy Department, 1901, pt. 1, p. 529.)

So deplorable is the situation of this country in the matter of recruiting its Navy that we are actually driven to send recruiting parties into the Mississippi Valley to obtain men whom it is hoped may be sufficiently trained to be transferred to the regular Navy as ordinary seamen.

"During the past year," says the Chief of the United States Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, in his report for 1901, "recruiting parties under various officers have been dispatched to various parts of the United States in the Mississippi Valley and to the eastward, the success of which has been uniform. Landsmen to the number of 4,198 have been enlisted. Of these, 3,141 men have been transferred, first to receiving ships, and then to the training squadron for landsmen. * * * It is believed that by this system about 3,500 men a year can be comfortably handled and so well trained that a majority can be transferred to active service in the rating of ordinary seamen and with such good foundation in seamanship and the duties of a man-of-war's man that they can soon be promoted to higher rates." (Report of the Secretary of the Navy, 1901, pt. 1, pp. 511, 512.)

During 1903 eight traveling recruiting parties were in the field, covering (to quote the words of the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation) "practically the whole of the United States." (Annual Report of Chief of Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department of the United States, 1903, p. 24.)

That the policy of trying to make seamen by what is in greater part shore drill is a confession of weakness and not expressive of the judgment of naval experts is palpable.

"If the men who take our ships to sea," observes Lord Brassey, "are far in advance of the men of any possible enemy, it is because the ship of the British navy is more at sea than that of any foreign power. The sea is the only place where the seaman can learn the duties of his trying and arduous profession." (Naval Annual for 1901, p. 6.)

It would appear that recruiting our Navy from men with perhaps no heart

for the sea, save in initial romantic ambition not tested by experience, is not a success, if the statistics of desertion be consulted.

For 1903, 4,236 of the 27,245 men in the Navy deserted. When it is considered that 7,145 of these 27,245 members of the Navy were petty officers and 4,380 were continuous-service men (classes comparatively exempt from desertions), and that among the reasons assigned by the Navy Department for reported desertions those figuring most prominently are such as certain almost exclusively to the landsmen, the conclusion seems reasonable that the percentage of desertions among the men enlisted from orders of citizens not familiar with the sea ran much higher than the 12.5 announced by the Bureau of Navigation as to the Navy in general. (Annual Report of Chief of Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department of United States, 1903, pp. 27, 28.)

Turning directly to the merchant marine, it is clear that the Federal Government has offended by omission and commission. The offending in the matter of ships and shipowners as distinguished from seamen it is not within the purpose of this paper to discuss. The offending as to seamen falls under these specifications:

Up to 1899 mariners in coastwise and over-sea vessels carrying our flag were huddled in insanitary forecables; given insufficient and unwholesome food; made a prey for crimps; afforded no sound safeguards for time or extent of payment of wages; denied protection of rest or life against undermanning; subjected to cruel and unusual punishments at the arbitrary will of masters and mates, and imprisoned for failure to comply with civil contracts to labor.

Since 1899, in the coastwise service, the forecables of sailing vessels built or rebuilt within the period have been made less insanitary than those of other vessels; the dietary has been bettered; crimping has been very materially decreased; payment of wages has been made less insecure and inequitable; the evil of undermanning has been suffered to extend; corporal punishment and imprisonment for desertion have been abolished.

Since 1899 in the over-sea service the forecables of sailing vessels built or rebuilt within the period have been made less unsanitary than those of other vessels; the dietary has been improved; crimping has been very slightly mitigated; payment of wages has been partially safeguarded; undermanning has been suffered to increase overwork and peril; corporal punishment has been abolished, and arrest and imprisonment for quitting work in a foreign port have been continued. Thus, although conditions in the merchant marine are somewhat less unhappy than prior to 1899, they remain unfavorable to progress of American seamanship in the coastwise trade and positively preventive of such progress in the over-sea trade.

X. TO ENCOURAGE THE BUILDING OF AMERICAN SHIPS IS NOT NECESSARILY TO PROMOTE AMERICAN SEAMANSHIP OR TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF AMERICAN SEAMEN: AMERICAN SHIPOWNERS MUST BE ENCOURAGED TO SEEK AMERICAN SEAMEN, AND AMERICAN BOYS MUST BE ENCOURAGED TO TURN TO THE SEA AND AMERICAN ADULT SEAMEN TO STAY THERE.

Although to state this proposition is to make argument a carrying of coals to Newcastle, it does not seem superfluous again and again to direct attention to it, for there is much in the recent history of the United States to justify the charge that development of an American merchant marine has been by many important public men treated as almost exclusively a matter of encouraging shipbuilding and shipowning, the manning of vessels coming in for little or no consideration, though perhaps the most important factor in the case.

Two Presidents of our country have in recent years called attention to this aspect of the problem presented by the decadence of its merchant sea service. In his message of December 3, 1889, President Harrison declared for "the development of a sufficient body of trained American seamen," as well as for enlargement of our merchant fleet. "We must encourage our merchant marine," said President McKinley in his first message to the Fifty-sixth Congress. "We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag, built and manned and owned by Americans."

XI. THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE SO AMENDED THAT FORECASTLES SHALL BE SANITARY; THAT CRIMPING SHALL CEASE; THAT SEAMEN SHALL BE PAID ON DEMAND IN ANY PORT OF CALL, AND ON DISCHARGE A REASONABLE PERCENTAGE OF WAGES EARNED; THAT STANDARDS OF SKILL FOR "ORDINARY SEAMEN," "ABLE SEAMEN," AND "FIREMEN" SHALL BE ESTABLISHED; THAT A MINIMUM SCALE FOR THE MANNING OF MERCHANT VESSELS SHALL BE PROVIDED, AND UNDERMANNING PROHIBITED; THAT ASIATICS MAY NOT SERVE ON SHIPBOARD; THAT IMPRISONMENT FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL CONTRACT SHALL NOT BE VISITED ON SEAMEN, AND THAT MERCHANT VESSELS SHALL BE OBLIGED IN SOME MEASURE TO TRAIN AMERICAN BOYS IN PRACTICAL SEAMANSHIP.

The propositions thus stated will be separately considered in consecutive order.

(a) Forecastsles.

No American vessel the construction whereof was begun prior to June 30, 1895, is subject to any law fixing forecastle space allowance per seaman. (Act of March 2, 1895.)

Every steam vessel the construction whereof was begun after June 30, 1895, is required to have for crew place "a space of not less than 72 cubic feet, and not less than 12 superficial feet measured on the deck or floor of that place, for each seaman or apprentice lodged therein." (Act of March 2, 1895.)

Every sailing vessel the construction whereof was begun after June 30, 1895, but before June 30, 1898, comes under the requirement last mentioned. (Act of March 2, 1895.)

Every sailing vessel built or rebuilt since June 30, 1898, is required to have for crew place "a space of not less than 100 cubic feet, and not less than 16 square feet measured on the deck or floor of that space, for each seaman or apprentice lodged therein." (Act of March 3, 1897.)

The foregoing use of the word "every" should be qualified to this extent: There are no provisions of law governing forecastle space in the case of fishing vessels, yachts, pilot boats, or vessels under 200 tons register; and Mississippi River steamboats have crew-space law peculiar to themselves.

Value of ship space keeps forecastle allotments to minimum fixed by law, as a rule. In most American merchant vessels that minimum is 2 by 6 by 6—smaller than a grave.

The ill effects of the neglect to oblige all vessels to provide sanitary forecastsles are convincingly shown by the reports of the Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, abounding as they do in proofs that our seamen, constitutionally hardy as a class and by reason of the purity of sea air more than ordinarily exempt from many of the dangers prevalent ashore, are sufferers in startling measure from disease, and most of all from such ills as spring from inadequacy and impurity of air.

Seamen aboard the average American merchant vessel are required to sleep and eat in quarters so cramped and, in consequence, so foul that were we to impose similar conditions on felons in our penitentiaries the nation would be moved to indignant protest. We have come to take neglect of the mariner as a matter of course.

The Congress should so alter the laws as that every vessel carrying the American flag shall provide for its seamen a comfortable and healthful place wherein to eat and sleep.

(b) Crimping.

The crimp is a vampire—a marine-employment agent—resorting to dishonest practices, whereby when seamen are numerous he gains such control of employment that he obliges vessel-seeking seamen to surrender to him so much of their yet unearned wages as the law permits to be assigned, and whereby when seamen are scarce the control of mariners gained at other times enables him to extort from seamen-seeking vessels a premium on each man supplied (a premium known as blood money). When he keeps a sailors' boarding house he adds to his other offenses a ruthless pillage of the seamen on whom he fastens, taking possession of his victim prior to payment of earned wages and absorbing such wages before pay day, becoming meanwhile a creditor to the extent of some portion of the wages to be earned by the seaman on his next voyage.

In passing on the allotment law of December 21, 1898, in the case of *Patterson et al. v. The Bark Eudora*, the United States Supreme Court said:

"The story of the wrongs done to sailors in the larger ports, not merely of this nation, but of the world, is an oft-told tale, and many have been the efforts to protect them against such wrongs. One of the most common means of doing these wrongs is the advancement of wages. Bad men lure them into haunts of vice, advance a little money to continue their dissipation, and having thus acquired a partial control, and by liquor dulled their faculties, place them on board the vessel just ready to sail and most ready to return the advances. When once on shipboard and the ship at sea, the sailor is powerless and no relief is availing." (Decision of June 1, 1903.)

Another phase of the crimping evil, not indicated by this quotation from the decision in the *Eudora* case, was suggested by His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, when, in a speech delivered before the Board of Trade at Liverpool in 1872, he declared it to be his firm conviction that "so long as the system of crimping and advance notes existed they would have no certainty as to how many ships might be lost before they had gone their first day's voyage." (Brassey's *The British Navy*, p. 8.) This, of course, because of the practice among crimps to ship the men out of whom they can make the most money, regardless of skill in seamanship.

Crimping flourishes in this country under cover of statutory law permitting assignment of unearned wages of seamen to persons who are not near and dependent relatives of such seamen, and because of absence of a statutory prohibition of payment of blood money. The remedy, so far as the Congress can put down the evil, lies in the repeal and enactment of laws as thus indicated.

(c) Payment of wages.

The maritime law of the United States now provides: "That every seaman on a vessel of the United States shall be entitled to receive from the master of the vessel to which he belongs one-half part of the wages which shall be due him at every port where such vessel, after the voyage has commenced, shall load or deliver cargo before the voyage is ended unless the contrary is expressly stipulated in the contract." (Act of December 21, 1898.)

It further provides: "And in all cases the seaman shall, at the time of his discharge, be entitled to be paid, on account of wages, a sum equal to one-third part of the balance due him." (Act of December 21, 1898.)

The seaman who finds himself in port without funds is in grave danger of falling into the hands of the crimp, and notwithstanding the provisions just quoted he commonly is in distress ashore with money due him from his ship, and this because he is driven by his necessities to contract against money payments in ports of call, and because many masters evade the requirement for one-third payment immediately on discharge.

The following excerpt from a report of the United States consul at Buenos Ayres illustrates the first of these statements:

"I attribute the unusual number of desertions to the law of December 21, 1898, which reads:

"Every seaman on a vessel of the United States shall be entitled to receive from the master of the vessel to which he belongs one-half part of the wages which shall be due him at every port where such vessel, after the voyage has commenced, shall load or deliver cargo before the voyage is ended unless the contrary be expressly stipulated in the contract."

"In my opinion, which is based upon observation, if the words in italics were not in the contract desertions would not be so numerous, for the following reasons:

"Most of the American vessels coming to this port sail from Boston, Mass. There the shipping articles are signed by the seamen before the United States shipping commissioner.

"On the front page of said articles, toward the bottom of the page, I find in almost all shipping articles the following words stamped: 'No money to be advanced during the voyage.' As a rule, it takes from sixty to seventy days for vessels to reach this port. The seamen, once the vessel is in port, will ask permission from the master of the vessel to go ashore, which permission is granted for twelve hours. He will ask for some money, which is refused, the master of the vessel claiming that the shipping articles which the seaman signed provide that no money is to be advanced during the voyage. The seaman goes ashore without a dollar in his pocket, he falls in with runners of boarding houses and shipping masters, by whom he is taken care of by being provided with liquor and eatables. In many cases the seaman gets intoxicated and does not return to his vessel, and at the expiration of the forty-eight hours from the time his permission to go ashore ceases the master promptly reports him a deserter.

"The vessel remains in port discharging and receiving cargo for about two months, and as the seaman has little or nothing to do—the cargo all being discharged by stevedores—by the seaman deserting the master or ship saves the wages, and I never knew of a master who worried about a deserted seaman. The shipping master takes hold of the deserter and soon finds another vessel for him (not an American vessel) and collects one month's allotment for board due him by the seaman. The ship saves from two to three months' wages by the seaman deserting. The shipping articles further provide that these seamen ship for from twelve to eighteen calendar months, and the first time they learn they can draw no wages is when they ask the master for money when the vessel is in port, and it is hardly to be expected that they will stand by their ships when they can be kept out of their wages for twelve to eighteen months." (Report of Consul Mayer to the Secretary of State, October 24, 1903.)

The act of December 21, 1898, should be so altered, on grounds of public policy, that stipulations against money payments in ports of call shall be void, and the penalty for evasion of that provision of the statute which requires immediate payment on discharge should be so changed as to make the requirement effective.

(d) Standards of skill.

Up to about the middle of the last century world-wide custom and usage, having the strength of law, made it almost impossible for anyone to ship as an able seaman who had not the sea experience and skill resulting from at least four years of sea service. The ratings aboard ships were boy, ordinary seaman, and able seaman.

This custom and usage has not been discarded by the Norse or the Dutch, among whom to-day any man who misrepresents his sea experience or skill is promptly reduced to his due rating.

For many years after abolition of her navigation laws Great Britain persevered in that ancient practice; but demand for cheap men led in time to disregard of the sound standards, until such deterioration of British seamanship obtained as aroused national concern and forced formal investigation for a remedy. The committee of inquiry, dissolved in 1880 after ten years of labor, included among its first suggestions for improvement of British seamanship this:

"That seamen before being rated as A B should obtain a certificate of competency."

Mr. John Williamson, secretary of the committee, said in his speech at Liverpool in October, 1880:

"I may here mention that subsequently, and as more light was thrown on the subject, we abandoned the idea of a certificate of competency for A B rating and instead of it adopted a sea-service qualification of not under four years." (Brassey's *The British Navy*, vol. 5, pp. 87, 88.)

The valuable recommendation of the committee led to nothing, however, and the deterioration has continued with such effect that an expert observer has recently written this comment on the British able seaman: "He may be a skilled mechanic, a man of energy, resource, and great abilities, or he may be just an unskilled laborer with precisely the same pay and treatment as the best seaman afloat of the same grade. This is a bad state of things." (Bullen's *Men of the Merchant Service*, p. 273.)

Mr. Bullen has not been blind to the relation between the deterioration and England's naval power, and he has suggested a line of remedial action.

"It is to be hoped most devoutly," he says, "that * * * it will be fully recognized that the only possible source of supply for the Navy in case of war is the mercantile marine. To secure such a supply, it is imperative that the A B shall be looked after and made to feel that he is a man of some importance to the State; that the good men shall not be handicapped by wasters; that a man shall earn the title of 'able seaman' before he is permitted to take it, and that every man shipping as A B who has no qualifications for that honorable post shall suffer for his misdeeds—his fraudulent burdening of his shipmates with work that he is unable to perform. Then I believe that we shall get in the merchant service a class of seamen—men who would not say that the sea was a life only fit for dogs." (Bullen's *Men of the Merchant Service*, p. 277.)

With the United States the abandonment of the time-approved custom and usage set in earlier than in the case of England, and deterioration of seamanship came with corresponding priority, persevering in such wise that Mr. Andrew Furuseth writing in 1900, declared: "The seamen must in the coastwise as well as the foreign trade meet the world. The Japanese, the Chinese, the Malay, the European, all may come and need bring no previous training. Our laws put life and property into their hands without asking any question except 'What will you work for?' Money is, it is claimed, saved in this way, and if the property is lost the insurance pays the loss. These men from anywhere, with any kind or no kind of skill and experience, set a wage for which sailors and firemen must work, or they must seek other employment. Our merchant marine is therefore manned by the residuum of the population, not only of our own country and race but of all countries and races." (American Federationist, April, 1900, p. 94.)

To arrest the deterioration of American seamanship, the Congress should provide by law that no person shall be employed as an A B who has served for fewer than four years at sea, one or more of them in a sailing vessel.

(e) Manning.

Regardless of the number of persons composing her crew, a vessel which has not enough skilled men to manage her in ordinary conditions of weather and sea without calling the lookout or the watch below is undermanned.

Undermanning imposes on skilled seamen inordinate toil and endangers life and property not only in the case of the vessel undermanned, but in the case of other vessels.

"An 'able seaman,' properly so called," as Mr. Frank Bullen observes, "is a skilled mechanic with great abilities." (Bullen's *Men of the Merchant Service*, p. 256.)

On sailing vessels his place in calm or storm never can be adequately filled by the unskilled, however numerous, nor on steamships in emergencies. (Bullen's *Men of the Merchant Service*, chapter 23.)

In other words, numerical strength of crew does not necessarily yield the totality of skill essential to safe navigation or reasonable distribution of the burden of toil incident to a voyage.

And when, to transpire the statement of a British expert, the incompetency of individuals is accentuated by inadequacy of numbers, sea life may be only a struggle against death and mayhap an unsuccessful struggle, with all implied by that in its bearing on loss of ships and cargoes.

Indeed, overwork through undermanning is not only essential to making land, but fixes new standards urging all seamen and all ships toward greater toil and graver peril. "By working for their lives," says the committee appointed in 1894 by the British Board of Trade to investigate concerning manning, in commenting on seamen handling an undermanned vessel, "they may succeed in reaching their destination, and thus they will have established their number as a proper crew for the vessel until a further reduction is made." (Report to the Board of Trade, June 4, 1896, p. 15.)

How undermanning operates to promote loss of life and property is illustrated by this quotation from the report last cited:

"The *Deeside* (569 tons gross) is a typical case. That vessel had only two men in a watch, and whilst one of those men was absent from the lookout, trimming a side light which had become dim, the vessel was run into and sunk with several of her crew, by the *Ludgate Hill* (4,063 tons gross). Notwithstanding the strong condemnation pronounced by the judge of the admiralty division of the high court against the practice of undermanning, which led to this fatal collision, the board of trade were advised that a prosecution would not be successful because, whilst there were sufficient men on board who might have been called and stationed on the lookout, it could not be said that the vessel was undermanned." (P. 8.)

An interesting general statement of the situation is thus made by Mr. F. W. Goding, United States consul at Newcastle, Australia:

"One of the most important factors in the successful management of ships at sea is a crew of competent men. If the master is a reasonable man, supported by well-drilled and competent officers, together with a crew of well-trained seamen, a good vessel can weather almost any storm. At the present time shipowners find great difficulty, in many instances, in obtaining the services of each and all of these men who are qualified for their duties, although many are found in possession of good discharges. This is due, in a great degree, to shipmasters, who frequently give able-seamen's discharges to men who have spent but a brief period at sea. Frequently vessels reach this port the entire crew of which had never before seen salt water. They include laborers, doctors, lawyers, parsons, clerks, farmers, and coal miners. It is a fact that many men are shipped in foreign-going sailing vessels whose sea-going experience is of the most limited description.

"In years gone by a long period of service was essential to gaining an able-seaman's discharge, and such a document could be relied upon as a guaranty that the possessor knew and could perform his work; but in those days men

made long voyages and were paid off in the home port after completing a period of service often extending over two or three years. To-day the practice is changed and the sailor, in the majority of cases, makes passages between ports only. He is either discharged or deserts, becomes stranded in some seaport, and is at the mercy of the crimp and the boarding-house keeper, who handles him as so much personal property. Consequent upon these conditions there is a continual interchange of discharges.

"The seaman who has been discharged for incompetency, or has deserted and has been ashore for some time, becomes a drug on some boarding-house master's hand. To secure him a vessel, a discharge is procured from a seaman with good credentials, recently paid off, and the incompetent man then goes to sea with a document indicating that he possesses all the necessary qualifications.

"When seamen are in demand there is nothing to prevent a shore man from being substituted for a competent sailor, as these men are frequently put on board at the moment of sailing. It is manifest that the shipmaster has no opportunity of testing their ability until it is too late to make an exchange. Shipmasters have informed me that they frequently find it difficult to secure three men out of the crew who could be trusted with the wheel in bad weather or to perform other duties pertaining to able seamanship.

"To this condition of affairs disaster, loss of property, and sometimes loss of life can be traced. It matters not how staunch a vessel may be, or how well officered, there are times when an incompetent crew may bring about her destruction. By long experience it has been found wise to employ competent sailors as petty officers, but too often a preference is shown for a class of men whose chief qualification is a capacity to handle cargo and drive sailors. The prime cause of this condition of affairs is partly due to unprincipled boarding-house masters, who supply crews to vessels, and partly to masters who give an able seaman's discharge to incompetent men—many times to get rid of them. This last can not be too strongly condemned, as it is both unfair to brother shipmasters and to the public. The first should be inquired into by the authorities." (Report to the Secretary of State of the United States, July 24, 1903.)

The British Board of Trade, impressed by the importance of the subject, in 1894 appointed a committee to inquire and recommend. After examining 176 expert witnesses this body reported on June 4, 1896, finding undermanning prevalent in the British mercantile marine, with consequent discouragement of British seamanship and loss of life and property. "In the opinion of your committee," said the body, "the only proper solution of the difficulty lies in the establishment of a manning scheme for general application," and thereupon recommended:

"That undermanning should by legislation be comprehended in the law authorizing detention for unseaworthiness, and that an instruction be issued to the officers of the board of trade authorizing them to detain vessels which are not manned in compliance with the schemes proposed by this committee.

"That undermanning should be specifically declared by statute to be unseaworthiness, but that no ship shall be deemed to be unseaworthy on leaving a port outside of the United Kingdom by reason of undermanning if it be shown that the shipowner or master has taken all reasonable means to comply with the regulations." (Report of committee, p. xi.)

The 1903 List of Merchant Vessels of the United States, issued by the Bureau of Navigation, United States Department of Commerce and Labor, can not be examined without resulting conviction that undermanning exists in the American merchant marine at least as extensively as the British committee has found it to exist in the fleet of England.

To illustrate:

The schooner *Allumna* (696 tons gross), North Bend, Oreg., carries eleven men, exclusive of master; the schooner *Addie M. Lawrence* (2,807 tons gross), Bath, Me., carries twelve men, exclusive of master.

The schooner *S. G. Wilder* (604 tons gross), Port Blakely, Wash., carries eleven men, exclusive of master; the schooner *S. G. Haskell* (681 tons gross), Millbridge, Me., carries seven men, exclusive of master. This means in the case of the *Wilder*, a cook, two mates, eight able seamen, leaving (with wheel and lookout manned) two men on deck. Her small sails can be handled by the watch. In the case of the *Haskell* it means a cook, two mates, and four able seamen, leaving one mate and two able seamen on the watch—the mate alone on deck when wheel and lookout are manned. The simplest work will require the calling of the lookout, and to take in even the small sails the watch below must be called.

The ship *Roanoke* (3,539 tons gross), Bath, Me., carries thirty men, exclusive of master; the schooner *Thomas W. Lawson* (5,218 tons gross), Quincy, Mass., carries sixteen men, exclusive of master. The difference here is between a square-rigger and a schooner; but, irrespective of rig, the larger vessel necessarily requires in gaining motive power the larger area of canvas. The *Lawson* has nineteen or twenty separate sails, while the *Roanoke* has more than thirty—wherefore, the sails on the *Lawson* are larger and therefore more difficult of handling than those on the *Roanoke*. The fact that some of the *Lawson's* sails are handled on deck does not justify the difference in manning. The *Lawson* uses steam in handling her sails—yes, in hoisting them—but machinery can not take the place of men in reefing or furling canvas in strong winds at sea. Human intelligence, skill, and adaptability must in such case be the safeguards.

The statistics of loss of ships at sea afford matter for reflection in this regard. They show, as the United States Commissioner of Navigation has summarized, that out of every 100 American seagoing steamers over 100 tons, for the past seven years, on the average 2.24 have been lost each year; that out of every 100 foreign seagoing steamers over 100 tons, for the same period, on the average 1.98 have been lost each year; that out of every 100 American seagoing sail vessels over 50 tons, for the past seven years, on the average 4.13 have been lost each year, and that out of every 100 foreign seagoing sail vessels over 50 tons, for the same period, on the average 2.97 have been lost each year. (Annual Report of Commissioner of Navigation, United States Department of Commerce and Labor, for 1903, p. 19.)

Mr. Andrew Furuseth says of manning conditions in the American merchant marine:

"The evil of undermanning is growing in a natural way.

"The shipbuilder figures on a reasonable crew and the owner cuts to make it a business crew. The master is competing with other masters, and his interest as well as his pride of seamanship induces him to agree with the owner. The crew is, therefore, cut somewhat when the vessel is yet new. Later, while she laying in some port where to fill vacancies is matter of expense and possibly of delay, her master suggests to his men that they are of sufficient skill and prowess to take the vessel half-manned to the next port. Good feeling and a sense of pride in their own ability cause the men to agree. Thereupon the vessel makes a fair passage, and the master is told by the owner that he has theretofore sailed his vessel overmanned. 'You used to carry eight A B's, captain,' he observes. 'You have brought her home with four A B's. In the future you will carry six men only.'

"The seaman's good nature, his willingness to oblige a good master by enduring excessive toil, have thus created a new standard—in the mind of the owner, a perfectly just one. The next trip the vessel has six men, and very likely half the number unskilled men. The work becomes harder—less sleep, less rest, scarcely a watch below without being called out.

"And this process goes on and on, so that we are nearing a point in the mer-

chant marine of America where sheets can not be hauled in or small sails taken in and furled with the watch on deck—with all that this overwork and imperviousness imply in increasing the drift from the sea."

Standards of manning should be provided by the Congress, and vessels not manned accordingly should be detained as unseaworthy. The minimum scales recommended by the committee appointed by the British board of trade to inquire into the manning of British merchant ships afford a valuable basis for legislation, alteration of course being advisable in so far as rig of our vessels differs from rig of the merchantmen of England.

(f) *Asiatics.*

The Pacific Ocean presents a problem having a factor peculiar to itself in that Asiatics are driving from it even those Caucasians who are eager to work in the stokeholds, saloons, and cooks' galleys, and on deck.

Mr. Andrew Furuseth testified as follows before the Committee on Immigration, Senate of the United States, February 4, 1902:

"We find that the stepmotherly manner in which seamen have been treated in the past has not induced the American boy to seek the sea for a living, and we therefore ask that we may now receive the benefit of such protection as you shall choose to give to other workers. We find it impossible to compete with the Chinese in any trade wherein they enter. They simply absorb the trade and drive us out, and where, as in the trade in question [that of the seaman], they are assisted by such legislation as we have, both in a positive and negative way, they will man every American steamer that now plies of shall hereafter ply between railroad terminals on the Pacific coast and the Orient."

"They are as a rule docile and attentive. They do not criticize among themselves any orders given, and if they do, it is not understood. They yield that ready obedience to, and apparent respect for, superiors which gradually becomes pleasing even to strong, well-balanced men. * * * Sailors of Chinese blood may be had in Hongkong in practically unlimited numbers at \$15 Mexican per month and firemen or stokers at \$18 per month, Mexican. This means, respectively, \$7.50 and \$9 in gold."

"The wages which would be paid to sailors if they were hired on the Pacific coast would be at least \$25 gold—more likely \$30 gold—being four times the amount paid to Chinese in Hongkong. A vessel would not carry as many whites as she does Chinese, but the difference in a year would probably be between \$30,000 and \$40,000 gold; a sum surely sufficient to determine the choice if the choice be left with the shipowner. * * * I do not think, gentlemen, that it would be safe to go on in the way you have been going. I do not think it is safe to put your merchant marine of the Pacific into the keeping of the Chinese, and unless you adopt some law that will give it to the whites, there is where it will go." (Chinese-Exclusion Hearings, Senate Committee on Immigration, pp. 242-257.)

In the course of his testimony before the Senate committee Mr. Furuseth stated that the trans-Pacific steamship companies controlling vessels running between oriental ports and transcontinental railway terminals in the Pacific States employ Chinese exclusively as sailors, stokers, cooks, stewards, and waiters.

During the latest Chinese-exclusion hearings before the same committee one of the trans-Pacific steamship corporations interested in this matter—the Pacific Mail Company—produced as a witness Capt. William B. Seabury, for thirty years in its service as a shipmaster on the Pacific. From his testimony, given on February 15, 1902 (Chinese-Exclusion Hearings, Senate Committee on Immigration, pp. 330-337), these statements are summarized:

1. Chinese are capable seamen under ordinary conditions, and because of their temperance and servility are preferred by Captain Seabury to white seamen.

2. There is no difficulty of obtaining an abundance of them in ports of China or at Hongkong, and the wage of sailors or firemen is about one-fourth the wage of white sailors or firemen shipped in Pacific coast ports.

3. Trans-Pacific liners plying between the Pacific States and the Orient employ exclusively Chinese as sailors, stokers, cooks, stewards, and waiters.

4. Not only are Chinese supplanting the Caucasians as seamen on the Pacific, but they are encroaching on the Japanese of that sea, and are also successfully competing with the Lascars on the Indian Ocean.

The testimony of Mr. Furuseth and Captain Seabury, concerning employment of Chinese seamen, is in line with a report of the United States Commissioner of Navigation. "The crews of our own steamships plying to China and Japan," says that officer, "are almost wholly Chinese and Japanese, shipped before American consuls at foreign ports where the vessels enter and clear." (Report Com. of Nav., 1898-99, p. 20.)

The sea progress of the world is likely to be increasingly toward enlargement of merchant fleets and strengthening of their naval guardians on the Pacific, and the national requirement of the United States increasingly great in the direction of encouragement of American boys and men to pursue the career of seamen in Pacific waters.

To persuade Americans to become and remain seamen on the Pacific every encouragement essential in the case of the Atlantic is needed, and positive discouragement of the disposition of capital to prefer Asiatics as seamen.

Nearly all observers of conditions in Asia agree that the immediate future holds for the Occident substantial growth of commerce with China, Japan, and the islands off the Asiatic mainland.

That the author of the ship-subsidy bill which passed the Senate during the Fifty-seventh Congress shares the faith of these observers and believes the United States is certain forthwith to enter on a largely increased trade with the Orient is shown by a speech delivered by him before the Senate of the United States March 3, 1902, wherein he declared that he expected vessels to the value of \$24,000,000 to be built, speedily, for our Asiatic trade if the bill were adopted, and that he further expected passage of the measure would be promptly followed by the establishing of a fortnightly mail service from San Francisco by way of Honolulu to Japan and China, with connections to Manila, vessels to be superior in speed and tonnage to the best steamers on the Asiatic routes of the great British, French, and German lines—five steamships to be employed, with a sixth in reserve, and that he hoped for this further immediate result, the establishing of a fortnightly service alternating with the San Francisco service, but operating from Puget Sound.

Whatever the progress of the commerce of America with Asia, it can not be wise to surrender to Orientals the forecastles of American ships engaged in the trade with the Far East.

Apart from the right of American seamen to protection from ruinous competition with Asiatics on the Pacific, it is not sound national policy to train in seamanship aliens who are not eligible to citizenship, and who can not become subject to draft into our Navy.

In his annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, the United States Commissioner of Navigation, in commenting on American ownership of numerous foreign vessels under foreign flags, said:

"For all national purposes these vessels contribute to the maritime strength of foreign nations, and are training schools for their navies." (P. 36.)

In the same way American ships manned by Asiatics are "training schools" for the navies of Asiatic powers.

Three objections have been urged by shipowners to debarring Asiatics

from employment in the American merchant marine: That Caucasians can not endure the heat of stokeholds in our trade with the Orient; that white seamen are not obtainable in the Far East; and that wage disadvantage would injure our fleet, with Asiatics debarring, in its competition with foreign bottoms manned by them.

The claim that Caucasians can not endure the heat of stokeholds in our trade with the Orient is erroneous.

The United States transports plying between San Francisco and Manila go nearer the equator than do our China liners, yet white men are employed on them as stokers and in other capacities. Even those transports which ply between the Atlantic coast and Manila via Suez carry white men in the stokeholds. The merchantmen plying between our Pacific coast and Australia cross the equator, as the Pacific Mail and Northern Pacific vessels never do, yet all of the Australian ships carry white men exclusively on deck and in stokeholds. So, too, all of our ships plying between San Francisco and Panama, though they pass through the great calm tract of the Pacific, a tract more deadly in heat than anything experienced in the China trade, carry white men only, not excluding the vessels owned by the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. In the same way all of the merchantmen plying between our Atlantic ports and the West Indies and South America carry white seamen as sailors and firemen.

The sailors and marine firemen of this country are eager for the work now performed under our flag by Asiatics. The claim that white seamen are not obtainable in the Far East has this much truth: White seamen are increasingly scarce everywhere, because of the conditions with which this paper deals; and because of the low wages of Asiatics, Far Eastern ports are comparatively undesirable for Caucasians.

But against this it should be considered that, with Asiatics barred, the crews of American vessels would not be engaged in Asiatic ports; that the filling of vacancies is all that would have then to be met; that for the reasons making Asiatic ports comparatively undesirable to Caucasian seamen, desertions there would be few; and that legislation could, while barring Asiatics in general, provide an exception for times when broken complements could not be filled without resort to them.

Moreover, shipowners are prone to exaggerate when the doing so may aid their profit as individuals, however it may fare with seamen and nation. Russia has recently had some experience in point, as appears from this report by Mr. R. T. Greener, United States commercial agent at Vladivostok:

"The difficulty of obtaining sufficient sailors to man the ships sailing from and to Vladivostok was attempted to be met in June by parties applying to St. Petersburg for permission to employ Chinese, as is done on United States, English, and Japanese ships. This move met with decided opposition from the military governor and the harbor master. They telegraphed to the Grand Duke Alexander Michaelovitch, asserting that the proposed change in the law would ruin the chances of Russian seamen to obtain employment; that at present there were in Vladivostok from 80 to 180 seafaring men seeking work; that the efforts of those who sought to employ Chinese, Koreans, etc., were merely to obtain 'cheap labor' at the expense of Russians who followed the sea as a profession."

"The Grand Duke was asked to antagonize this petition. He promptly answered that he was glad to learn of the matter, admitted the truth of the representations to him, and promised to use his influence to have the present law left intact." (Report to the Secretary of State of the United States, November 19, 1903.)

The claim as to wages is well founded; but it may be met by legislation granting subsidy to the extent of wage difference in cases of competition with foreign bottoms manned by Asiatics, and it is believed the United States can not prudently hesitate to equalize by subsidy, if that be needful, in saving our ships for our own race.

(g) *Involuntary servitude.*

Section 4596 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides that any seaman (this term including all ship employees except the master) who shall violate his contract to serve on a private vessel may in a foreign port (in our foreign trade) be imprisoned for not more than one month.

Section 4600 of the Revised Statutes of the United States makes it the duty of consular officers of this country to reclaim deserting seamen and to surrender them to masters.

The United States is a party to treaties with numerous governments in accordance with the terms whereof there is a mutual obligation to apprehend and deliver up to masters deserting seamen.

These laws are a survival of the odious ancient idea that one man can have property right in another. It has been outgrown in America as to every class but seamen. It has been abandoned in America as to all American seamen on American soil, in British North America, Mexico, and the West Indies. Until it shall have been abandoned as to all seamen of all ships flying the flag of our Republic, no matter whence or whether they voyage, how can American boys, pulsing with the American concept of human liberty, follow the sea?

(h) *Boys.*

The American boy no longer goes to sea. The American boy who seeks the sea is exceedingly exceptional, and encounters this condition: American ships do not want him.

When American sea life shall have been made fit for American boys, lads of certain temperament will turn to the sea as water seeks its level. Beyond this, the Congress, taking notice of that individual selfishness which impels shipowners to avoid tasking themselves with the education of boys in seamanship, should oblige them to do this to a reasonable measure, at least in our coastwise trade, wherein they are protected from competition with foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes a similar request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12920, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

RELIEF OF SETTLERS ON LANDS IN SHERMAN COUNTY, OREG.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up for immediate consideration the bill S. 277.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Oregon give his attention? Has this bill passed the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. It is not at the desk. Does the gentleman know where it is?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I gave a copy of it to the Clerk. It is Senate bill 277. I have the report of the Senate committee here.

The SPEAKER. But it will be necessary to have the bill itself.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Did I not send up the bill just now? Did I not give that to the Clerk?

The SPEAKER. That is a mere print. The Senate bill ought to be on the Speaker's table. Possibly it has been referred to the appropriate committee and is not reported back.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The Senate bill has passed the Senate, has come over here, and has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. But the bill itself is not at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman says it has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. And has been reported favorably.

The SPEAKER. Has it been reported by the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes, sir. The bill has been referred and reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can be recognized at a later time. The bill does not seem to be here.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Washington*, Henry Chichester, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the brig *Orion*, Frederick Hopkins, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6493) to ratify and confirm act No. 47 of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1020); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6494) to approve and ratify act No. 73 of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1021); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. FORDNEY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4570) to provide an American register for the steamer *Beaumont*, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1019); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6351) to pay J. B. McRae \$99 for services as hos-

pital steward, etc.—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6343) granting a pension to Harry Hirschensohn—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 12644) to provide for the taking of a census of agricultural statistics in the year 1905 and every tenth year thereafter—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12645) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to further improve Trinity River, in Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 12646) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the Navy of the United States, and to define its duties and regulate its pay—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12647) to establish a supreme court for the Indian Territory and to provide for additional United States judges therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 12648) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the public hay scales, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 12649) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 4766 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 12650) to amend section 5209 of the Revised Statutes United States, 1878—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPALDING: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 45) to print 275,000 copies of Diseases of Cattle—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 46) to print and bind 200,000 copies of the special report of the Bureau of Animal Industry on the diseases of the horse—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SPALDING: A resolution (H. Res. 222) requesting the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to furnish certain information relative to prices upon certain manufactured articles as sold in the United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A resolution (H. Res. 223) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts under the terms of the Tucker Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A resolution (H. Res. 224) referring certain cases to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts under the terms of the Tucker Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12651) granting an increase of pension to William H. Shine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 12652) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 12653) for the relief of Michael H. Farrell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12654) for the relief of Clement C. Anderton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 12655) for the relief of John Bremond—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 12656) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12657) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Mexico, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12658) granting an increase of pension to James Leavy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 12659) for the relief of Edward Lugo-Vina—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 12660) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Russell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 12661) authorizing the President to appoint Charles H. Pendleton a lieutenant-commander on the retired list, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12662) granting an increase of pension to John A. Stuart, alias John Vanderpool—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 12663) for the relief of Ezra J. Baney—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12664) granting an increase of pension to Rachael J. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12665) to amend the military record of Odgen H. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 12666) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. W. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANNING: A bill (H. R. 12667) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 12668) granting an increase of pension to Irvn Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12669) for the relief of Emmett O. Wampler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 12670) granting an increase of pension to William Nease—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12671) granting an increase of pension to William Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 12672) granting a pension to William Hoyt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12673) granting a pension to Ira Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12674) granting a pension to Sarah Cordin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 12675) granting a pension to Emma Swanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 12676) granting an increase of pension to James A. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12677) for the relief of Joseph Schrems—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 12678) to authorize the detail of George F. Ormsby in the interest of commerce—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 12679) for the relief of M. L. Skidmore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEEMS: A bill (H. R. 12680) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Polen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12681) granting a pension to R. J. Jamison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 12682) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Bolt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 12683) correcting military record of Jesse L. Meeks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: Resolution of Diamond Lodge, No. 183, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Cambria, Wis., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 11827, granting an increase of pension to Daniel Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 10172, granting a pension to Catharine A. Leonard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 12155, granting a pension to Nancy Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 12157, granting an increase of pension to Asher D. Bice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 11826, granting a pension to Joseph Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 12156, granting an increase of pension to Nine Holvenstot, minor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of C. H. Grant and other master mariners, relative to a harbor of refuge at Cold Spring Inlet, New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of Builders' Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., against bill H. R. 89—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles R. Hamilton and 10 others, of Kenmore, N. Y., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Resolution of Potomac Post, No. 11, Grand Army of the Republic, of Washington, D. C., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: Petition of citizens of New London County, Conn., favoring bill granting lands in severalty to the landless Indians of northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. B. U. Hatfield and 31 others, of Groton, Conn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of Lodge No. 650, International Association of Machinists, of Plattsmouth, Nebr., relative to increasing the capacity of the Naval Gun Factory at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: Papers to accompany bill for relief of John Bremond—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 11255, granting an increase of pension to Catherine L. Benteen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Port Arthur Lodge, No. 149, International Association of Machinists, of Pittsburg, Kans., relative to increasing capacity of Naval Gun Factory at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Fred Blanchard and 124 others, of Cedarville, Kans.; Rev. F. M. Taylor and 6 others, of Walnut, Kans.; Nelson Call and 39 others, of Oswego, Kans., and J. K. Oliver and 42 others, of Elk Falls, Kans., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSEL: Petition of the pharmacists of Lancaster County, Pa., in favor of bill H. R. 9303—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNELL: Letter of C. D. Jones, of Scranton, Pa., in favor of the establishment of a Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter of William D. Zehnder, president of Scranton Bolt and Nut Company, protesting against the enactment of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CROMER: Resolution of John P. Post Post, No. 83, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: Resolution of Plymouth (N. H.) Grange, favoring increased salaries for rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of John F. Dunkler and 42 others, of Peterboro, N. H., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to George Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 10892, to correct the military record of David Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Margaret Russell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of H. W. Anvil and 15 others and George S. West and 8 others, of Parsons, W. Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of heirs of James L. Geaslem, praying reference of claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of H. E. Tyson and 29 others, L. B. Moore and 42 others, C. K. Switzer and 7 others, and W. Chenoweth and 52 others, all of Philippi, W. Va., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Petition of Allen J. Patrick, praying reference of claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of heirs of John Turley, deceased, praying reference of claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Resolutions of Cummings Post, No. 37; C. J. Ormsbee Post, No. 18; George S. Gale Post, No. 107; Cambridge Post, No. 10; Waterson Post, No. 45; William J. Fuller Post, No. 52; Old Brigade Post, No. 47; Stannard Post, No. 2; R. S. Sherman Post, No. 86; Jesse A. Jemett Post, No. 73; A. L. Pike Post, No. 41; George A. Custer Post, No. 42; Walter C. Dunton Post, No. 110; Dudley Post, No. 28; A. E. Leavenworth Post, No. 108, and Stow Post, No. 29, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Vermont, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, in favor of the bill providing for a retired list and pensions in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, favoring exemption of head tax from residents of Newfoundland entering the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of O. H. P. Sargent Post, No. 152, of Essex, Mass.; Everett Peabody Post, No. 108, of Georgetown, Mass., and Union Post, No. 50, of Peabody, Mass., Grand Army of the Re-

public, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of W. T. Sutherland and others, and L. B. Wiseman and 67 others, of Floresville, Tex.; and John B. Hardwick and 33 others, of Corpus Christi, Tex., in favor of Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 6595, granting pension to Capt. John H. McBrayer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of Meadow City Lodge, No. 448, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Northampton, Mass., in favor of bill H. R. 89 and of Bates employers' liability bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Amherst (Mass.) Woman's Club, requesting that lands in severalty be granted to the landless Indians of northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Joseph W. Flint and 102 other voters of Enfield, Mass., urging passage of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of E. K. Wilcox Post, No. 19, of Springfield; George C. Strong Post, No. 166, of Easthampton; H. V. Smith Post, No. 140, of Athol; General Sedgwick Post, No. 17, of Orange; J. W. Lawton Post, No. 88, of Ware; Samuel F. Woods Post, No. 179, of Barre; Ezra Batcheller Post, No. 51, of North Brookfield; General William S. Lincoln Post, No. 211, of Enfield; Charles C. Smith Post, No. 183, of South Hadley Falls; Parker Post, No. 123, of Athol; Clara Barton Post, No. 65, of Warren; E. J. Griggs Post, No. 97, of Belchertown; Manton E. Taft Post, No. 162, of Turners Falls; William L. Becker Post, No. 86, of Northampton, and E. M. Stanton Post, No. 147, of Amherst, all in Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, and executive committee of Union Veterans' Union of Massachusetts, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Armory Hill Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Springfield; Robert M. Brainard and 19 others, of Hadley; Rollston Church and 24 others, of Fitchburg; Harry G. Butler and 27 others, of Hubbardston; Frederick H. White and 16 others, of Winchendon; Rev. E. D. Francis and 24 others, of Ludlow; Rev. F. J. Hale and 16 others, of Chicopee Falls; Frank McCheeney and 17 others, of Orange; Rev. Ernest White and 15 others, of Berlin; Rev. D. Butler Pratt and 33 others, of Springfield; Putnam Webber and 24 others, of Ware; Rev. Henry L. Wriston and 21 others, of Springfield; John B. Perkins and 51 others, of Plymouth; J. H. Mansfield and 44 others, of Gardner, and W. M. Crawford and 15 others, of Warren, all in Massachusetts, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petitions of Rev. A. Crabtree and 10 others, F. H. Jackson and 7 others, and Rev. C. M. Melden and 12 others, all of Providence, R. I., in favor of Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephen Rice and James A. Sams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Athiel A. McAlister—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of F. R. Vaughan and 40 others, of Brattleboro, Vt., in favor of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition of Pacific Coast Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association, of San Francisco, Cal., against bill S. 3937—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Resolutions of J. A. Mower Post, No. 59, Grand Army of the Republic, of Stromsburg, Nebr., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Resolutions of George R. Maxwell Post, No. 5, and James B. McKean Post, No. 1, both of Salt Lake City, and Dix Logan Post, No. 3, of Ogden, Department of Utah, Grand Army of the Republic, urging passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNTER: Paper to accompany bill granting pension to Jeremiah Bruton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELHER: Resolutions of Major George L. Stearns Post, No. 149, of Boston, Mass., Grand Army of the Republic, urging passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the general court of Massachusetts, in support of bill pending in Congress providing for a retired list and pension in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: Resolutions of Lieutenant G. W. Fuller Post, No. 378, of Catasqua, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, urging passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Manufacturers' Club, relative to increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, Md., relative to the improvement of the main ship channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LANNING: Petition of Rev. W. M. Wilson and 21 other voters, and J. V. Cruser and 19 other voters, of Princeton, N. J., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVERNASH: Petition of the Northern California Indian Association, for relief of the landless Indians of northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: Resolution of Robert F. Elliott Post, No. 526, Grand Army of the Republic, of Spring Run, Pa., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Colonel James G. Elder Post, No. 570, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Thomas, Pa., urging passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of D. Ferguson and 27 others, of Park River, and Thomas Catherwood and 77 others, of Park River, N. Dak., and vicinity, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Emmett O. Wampler—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of E. H. Bachman and 44 others of Lebanon County, Pa., in favor of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Auburn Lodge, No. 19, International Association of Machinists, of Auburn, Ind., relative to increasing capacity of the Naval Gun Factory—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolutions adopted by the National Board of Trade, urging the repeal of the desert-land act and other laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, urging the prompt completion of the breakwater at Point Judith, R. I.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions adopted by the United Commercial Travelers of America, New York Council, No. 114, urging the enactment of the amendment to the bankruptcy law proposed by Mr. BADGER—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, indorsing bills S. 2259 and 2263—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the National League of Commission Merchants, favoring the adjudication by the courts of the legality of certain contracts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the assembly of the State of New York, indorsing the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition numerously signed by members of the Metropolitan Yacht Club, protesting against the passage of the amendment to the act providing for certain requirements for vessels propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha, or electric motors, approved June 18, 1897—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of Dr. H. C. Carpenter and 58 others, of Lake Odessa, Mich., and M. E. Remmele and 17 others, of Clarksville, Mich., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. J. Herman Randall and 53 others, favoring passage of the Gallinger liquor bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of Charles G. Boise and 18 others, of Sherbrooke; D. H. Fosburg and 20 others, of Byron and Hanna; William Inglis and 7 others, of Tyner; H. R. Cook and 41 others, of Cavalier; J. B. Woodruff and 16 others, of Thompson; Christina Carbron and 20 others, of Dwight; R. Lavik and 26 others, of Milner; Joseph Whaley and 40 others, and W. J. Glass and 51 others, of Inkster; J. H. Oliver and 64 others, of Lisbon; F. W. Harron and 59 others, of Sheldon; W. H. Hunter and 16 others, of Milner; P. E. Stevens and 105 others, of Grand Forks, and Stephen Whitford and 35 others, and John Halkrow, jr., and 34 others, of Beaumont, all in South Dakota, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Frank W. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Papers to accompany claim of Mrs. Jennie Miller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of Fort Worth, Tex., urging the passage of bill H. R. 6, relating to the sale of tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of the Ohio Vicksburg Battlefield Commission, relative to the Vicksburg National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of members of King Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of International Association of Machinists of St.

Paul, Minn., in favor of Government ownership of factories for naval construction—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of Alonzo W. Bond and 21 other voters of Worcester, Mass., against the passage of a bill limiting the hours of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of L. G. Lesure and 20 other voters of West Boylston, Mass., urging passage of Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VREELAND: Resolution of D. T. Wiggins Post, No. 297, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Rev. F. W. Grupe and others, of Gainesville, N. Y., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Staunton Post, No. 396, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lakey, N. Y., favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEMS: Petition and papers to accompany bill H. R. 11344, granting a pension to Emma Bingham Pearce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of John H. Willis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Short Creek Monthly Meeting of Friends, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Hess Post, No. 595, of Armstrongs Mills; Drummond Post, No. 203, of St. Clairsville; Robert Hilles Post, No. 220, of Barnesville; Brannum Post, No. 221, of Bridgeport; Taylor Post, No. 616, of Somerton; E. M. Stanton Post, No. 166, of Steubenville; General W. P. Richardson Post, No. 609, of Woodsfield; Harlem Springs Post, No. 624, of Harlem Springs; James P. Mann Post, No. 267, of Lewisville, and J. G. Riethmüller Post, of Hannibal, Grand Army of the Republic, all of Ohio, for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 12301, for the relief of D. L. d'Elysee, alias Leopold Böhm—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Alexander Reun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 20, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on the request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Washington*, Henry Chichester, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel brig *Orion*, Frederick Hopkins, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel brig *Fly*, James Merrihew, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 113) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the State of Vermont money appropriated by the act of Congress of July 1, 1902, and to adjust mutual claims between the United States and the State of Vermont;

A bill (S. 3720) to authorize the St. Joseph and Grand Island Railway Company, in the reconstruction of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Joseph, Mo., to lower said bridge and to shorten the draw span thereof; and

A bill (S. 3800) donating gun carriages to the Connecticut commissioners for the care and preservation of Fort Griswold.

The message also announced that the House had passed with amendments the bill (S. 3317) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian Territory in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 4074) constituting Utica, N. Y., a port of delivery, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8435) to amend the act of Congress of March 11, 1902, relating to homesteads;

A bill (H. R. 9777) granting to the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, for park purposes, certain portions of the Government reserve in said city; and

A bill (H. R. 12446) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 38) granting an increase of pension to Miriam R. Adams;

A bill (S. 70) granting an increase of pension to John G. Brown;

A bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Strickland;

A bill (S. 142) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Nichols;

A bill (S. 167) granting an increase of pension to J. Hudson Kibbe;

A bill (S. 189) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 191) granting an increase of pension to Francis Roy;

A bill (S. 265) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gray;

A bill (S. 593) granting an increase of pension to William H. Horn;

A bill (S. 594) granting an increase of pension to Finley T. Johnson;

A bill (S. 782) granting a pension to Mary D. Duval;

A bill (S. 797) granting a pension to Mary H. Allen;

A bill (S. 846) granting an increase of pension to Catharine W. Collins;

A bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Allen W. (alias Albert) Hall;

A bill (S. 889) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Brown;

A bill (S. 891) granting an increase of pension to Erwin R. Cole;

A bill (S. 895) granting an increase of pension to Charles Disbrow;

A bill (S. 897) granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Frogge;

A bill (S. 962) granting an increase of pension to Jennet Thoits;

A bill (S. 980) granting an increase of pension to Mary von Kusserow;

A bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to John Adamson;

A bill (S. 1241) granting an increase of pension to Hamlet F. Roberts;

A bill (S. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Davis;

A bill (S. 1356) granting a pension to Robert Kelley;

A bill (S. 1358) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lackey;

A bill (S. 1428) granting an increase of pension to George Pennington;

A bill (S. 1451) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor H. Hord;

A bill (S. 1490) to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 1532) granting an increase of pension to Electa Allen;

A bill (S. 1597) granting a pension to Rosa D. Mayhew;

A bill (S. 1688) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Bellman;

A bill (S. 1689) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Houghton;

A bill (S. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Decker;

A bill (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Couch;